



## San Bernardino Associated Governments

1170 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, San Bernardino, CA 92410

Phone: (909) 884-8276 Fax: (909) 885-4407

Web: [www.sanbag.ca.gov](http://www.sanbag.ca.gov)



- 
- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission •San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
  - San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency •Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
- 

## AGENDA

### Mountain/Desert Committee Measure I Committee

November 17, 2006

9:00 a.m.

Town of Apple Valley  
14955 Dale Evans Parkway  
Apple Valley, CA

### *Mountain/Desert Committee Membership*

#### Chair

*Bill Postmus  
Board of Supervisors*

*Lawrence Dale, Mayor  
City of Barstow*

*Rick Roelle, Mayor Pro Tem  
Town of Apple Valley*

#### Vice Chair

*James Lindley, Council Member  
City of Hesperia*

*Dennis Hansberger  
Board of Supervisors*

*Mike Rothschild, Mayor  
City of Victorville*

*Kevin Cole, Mayor  
City of Twentynine Palms*

*Darrell Mulvihill,  
Council Member  
City of Big Bear Lake*

*Rebecca Valentine  
Council Member  
City of Needles*

*Paul Cook, Mayor  
Town of Yucca Valley*

*Trinidad Perez, Mayor Pro Tem  
City of Adelanto*

*San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) is a council of governments formed in 1973 by joint powers agreement of the cities and the County of San Bernardino. SANBAG is governed by a Board of Directors consisting of a mayor or designated council member from each of the twenty-four cities in San Bernardino County and the five members of the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors*

*In addition to SANBAG, the composition of the SANBAG Board of Directors also serves as the governing board for several separate legal entities listed below:*

***The San Bernardino County Transportation Commission***, which is responsible for short and long range transportation planning within San Bernardino County, including coordination and approval of all public mass transit service, approval of all capital development projects for public transit and highway projects, and determination of staging and scheduling of construction relative to all transportation improvement projects in the Transportation Improvement Program.

***The San Bernardino County Transportation Authority***, which is responsible for administration of the voter-approved half-cent transportation transactions and use tax levied in the County of San Bernardino.

***The Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies***, which is responsible for the administration and operation of a motorist aid system of call boxes on State freeways and highways within San Bernardino County.

***The Congestion Management Agency***, which analyzes the performance level of the regional transportation system in a manner which ensures consideration of the impacts from new development and promotes air quality through implementation of strategies in the adopted air quality plans.

***As a Subregional Planning Agency***, SANBAG represents the San Bernardino County subregion and assists the Southern California Association of Governments in carrying out its functions as the metropolitan planning organization. SANBAG performs studies and develops consensus relative to regional growth forecasts, regional transportation plans, and mobile source components of the air quality plans.

*Items which appear on the monthly Board of Directors agenda are subjects of one or more of the listed legal authorities. For ease of understanding and timeliness, the agenda items for all of these entities are consolidated on one agenda. Documents contained in the agenda package are clearly marked with the appropriate legal entity.*

**San Bernardino Associated Governments  
County Transportation Commission  
County Transportation Authority  
Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies  
County Congestion Management Agency**

**AGENDA**

**Mountain/Desert Committee  
\*Measure I Committee**

**November 17, 2006  
9:00 a.m.**

Town of Apple Valley  
14955 Dale Evans Parkway  
Apple Valley, CA

**CALL TO ORDER**  
(Meeting Chaired by Bill Postmus)

- I. Attendance:
- II. Agenda Notices/Modifications:
- III. Announcements:

- 1. **Possible Conflict of Interest Issues for the Mountain/Desert Committee Meeting of November 17, 2006.** Pg. 6

Note agenda item contractors, subcontractors and agents, which may require member abstentions due to conflict of interest and financial interests. Board Member abstentions shall be stated under this item for recordation on the appropriate item.

***Notes/Actions***

## Consent Calendar

\* Items marked with an asterisk denote review/action by both the Mountain/Desert Committee and Measure I Committee.

### 2. Attendance Register

Pg. 7

A quorum shall consist of a majority of the membership of each SANBAG Policy Committee, except that all County Representatives shall be counted as one for the purpose of establishing a quorum.

## Discussion Items

\* Items marked with an asterisk denote review by both the Mountain/Desert Committee and Measure I Committee.

### 3. Status of projects in Lucerne Valley

Pg. 9

Receive status report on projects in Lucerne Valley on State Route 18 and State Route 247 (See attached Project Summary Status Report)  
**Deborah Barmack**

### 4. Findings from the September 2006 Transportation Development Act Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearings

Pg. 11

Adopt Resolution 07-004; Resolution of the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission Adoption of Unmet Transit Needs Findings for the Public Hearings held in September 2006. **Beth Kranda**

### \* 5. Measure I Victor Valley and Mountains Subarea Boundary Change

Pg. 30

Make recommendation to the Jurisdictions of the Victor Valley and Mountains Subareas to Approve the Revised Measure I Subarea Boundaries. **Ryan Graham**

### \* 6. Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan Policy Issues

Pg. 33

Review and discuss white paper issues for furtherance of the Strategic Plan. **Deborah Barmack**

### \* 7. Revised Apple Valley Measure I Local Pass-Through Fund Audit

Pg. 49

Accept the Revised Measure I Local Pass-Through Fund Audit Summary Sheets for the Town of Apple Valley for the year ending June 30, 2005. **Deborah Barmack**

8. Quarterly Administrative Report on SANBAG Federal Funding Pg. 52  
Programs

- 1) Receive report on quarterly reporting and obligation status.
- 2) Adopt a finding of compliance with obligation requirements for all affected agencies. Ty Schuiling

**Public Comments**

Items under this heading will be referred to staff for further study, research, completion and/or future actions.

9. Additional Items from Committee Members

10. Brief Comments by the General Public

**Additional Information**

Acronym List

Pg. 58

**ADJOURNMENT**

Complete packages of this agenda are available for public review at the SANBAG offices. Staff reports for items may be made available upon request. For additional information call (909) 884-8276.

**December Mountain/Desert Committee Meeting - CANCELLED**

**Next Mountain/Desert Committee Meeting – Friday, January 19, 2007**

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority  
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

### *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 1

**Date:** November 17, 2006

**Subject:** Information Relative to Possible Conflict of Interest

**Recommendation\*:** Note agenda items and contractors/subcontractors which may require member abstentions due to possible conflicts of interest.

**Background:** In accordance with California Government Code 84308, members of the Board of Directors may not participate in any action concerning a contract where they have received a campaign contribution of more than \$250 in the prior twelve months from an entity or individual. This agenda contains recommendations for action relative to the following contractors:

Item No.	Contract No.	Contractor/Agents	Subcontractors
		None	

**Financial Impact:** This item has no direct impact on the 2006/2007 Budget.

**Reviewed By:** This item is prepared monthly for review by the Board of Directors and policy committee members.

**Responsible Staff:** Deborah Barmack, Director of Management Services

*Approved*  
*Mountain/Desert Committee*

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Moved:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Second:* \_\_\_\_\_

*In Favor:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Opposed:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Abstained:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Witnessed:* \_\_\_\_\_

# MOUNTAIN/DESERT COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE ROSTER – 2006

Name	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Kevin Cole City of Twentynine Palms		**		X	**		X	**	X	X		
Paul Cook Town of Yucca Valley	X	**		X	**	X	X	**	X	X		
Lawrence Dale City of Barstow	X	**	X	X	**	X	X	**	X			
Dennis Hansberger County of San Bernardino	X	**	X	X	**	X		**				
James Lindley City of Hesperia	X	**	X	X	**	X	X	**	X	X		
Darrell Mulvihill City of Big Bear Lake		**	X		**		X	**	X			
Bill Postmus County of San Bernardino	X	**			**			**	X	X		
Rick Roelle Town of Apple Valley	X	**		X	**	X		**	X	X		
Mike Rothschild City of Victorville	X	**		X	**	X	X	**	X	X		
Rebecca Valentine City of Needles	X	**	X	X	**	X	X	**	X	X		
+Trinidad Perez City of Adelanto	X	**	X		**			**				

\*Non-Voting City Representative attended  
+ Measure I Committee representative

\*\*The Mountain/Desert Committee did not meet

\*\*\* New SANBAG Board Member

The crossed-out boxes indicate members who were not on the committee as of that month.  
The empty boxes indicate member who did not attend the meeting that month.

## MOUNTAIN/DESERT COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE ROSTER – 2005

Name	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Kevin Cole City of Twentynine Palms	X	X		**	X		**		X	X	**	X
Paul Cook Town of Yucca Valley	X	X	X	**	X	X	**	X	X	X	**	X
Lawrence Dale City of Barstow	X	X	X	**	X		**	X		X	**	
Dennis Hansberger County of San Bernardino		X		**	X	X	**	X	X	X	**	X
James Lindley City of Hesperia	X	X	X	**	X	X	**		X	X	**	X
Darrell Mulvihill City of Big Bear Lake		X	X	**		X	**	X		X	**	X
Bill Postmus County of San Bernardino		X	X	**	X		**	X			**	X
Rick Roelle Town of Apple Valley	X	X	X	**	X	X	**	X	X	X	**	X
Mike Rothschild City of Victorville	X	X	X	**			**	X	X	X	**	X
Rebecca Valentine City of Needles	X	X	X	**	X	X	**	X	X	X	**	X
+Trinidad Perez City of Adelanto	X		X	**	X	X	**	X		X	**	X

\*Non-voting City Representative attended  
+ Measure I Committee representative

\*\*The Mountain/Desert Committee did not meet

\*\*\* New SANBAG Board Member

The crossed-out boxes indicate members who were not on the committee as of that month.  
The empty boxes indicate member who did not attend the meeting that month.



- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority  
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 3

**Date:** November 17, 2006

**Subject:** Status of projects in Lucerne Valley

**Recommendation:**\* Receive status report on projects in Lucerne Valley on State Route 18 and State Route 247 (See attached Project Summary Status Report)

**Background:** Following the April 21, 2006 Mountain/Desert Meeting Chuck Bell, with County of San Bernardino-Caltrans and SANBAG Staff met to discuss the status of projects within the Lucerne Valley. The meeting was in response to concerns raised by Chuck Bell about the need for improvements to SR-18 and SR-247 that had either been delayed or not addressed. Attachment 1 provides a status report on the projects on SR-18 and SR-247 that are sponsored by both the County of San Bernardino and Caltrans as of the April 21, 2006 Meeting.

**Financial Impact:** This item has no direct impact on the adopted SANBAG Budget. Staff activities associated with this item are consistent with the adopted SANBAG Budget, Task No. 94107000, Mountain/Desert Planning and Project Development

**Reviewed By:** This item is scheduled for review by the Mountain/Desert Committee on November 17, 2006.

**Responsible Staff:** Deborah Barmack  
Director of Management Services  
Ryan Graham  
Transportation Planning Specialist

\*

*Approved*  
*Mountain/Desert Committee*

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Moved:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Second:* \_\_\_\_\_

*In Favor:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Opposed:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Abstained:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Witnessed:* \_\_\_\_\_

# Attachment 1

## Summary of Caltrans, County of San Bernardino, Lucerne Valley and SANBAG Meeting

State Route #	Project Description	Summary from Meeting
SR-18	1 mile passing lane (4 lanes) and realignment from mile 80-81. Includes shoulder work, right/left turn pockets, etc.	Parties will work on rescoping the project as a safety project only. Since ADT is not the issue at the moment, but unsafe passing and bunched traffic is, the focus is to be on turn pockets.
SR-18	Turn pockets at High Road	Was initially funded but Caltrans pulled the funding during the State's budget crisis. Caltrans believes that the funding for the project will be available in 2007
SR-18	Resurface west bound lane between Lucerne Valley and Apple Valley - damaged by heavy truck traffic	This is a maintenance project. Dan Kupolsky to get Chuck Bell the contact information
SR-18	Left turn pockets at Custer and Tradeport Roads. - right turn lane at Highland Rd. - all 3 projects in conjunction with County Trans	Caltrans is in the process of updating the route concept plan for SR-18. Once this is finished, the County will need to review the plan relative to the community plan for Lucerne Valley. Lucerne Valley and County to meet regarding road fee plans.
SR-18	Left turn pocket at Kendall	Caltrans is in the process of updating the route concept plan for SR-18. Once this is finished, the County will need to review the plan relative to the community plan for Lucerne Valley. Lucerne Valley and County to meet regarding road fee plans.
SR-247	LVEDA and the School District have made numerous written and verbal requests for a flashing yellow beacon on north and south portions of SR 247 at the elementary school (located on the west side of SR 247).	Dan Kupolsky from Caltrans to confer with Haissam about the status of the project
SR-247	Lower the speed limit on SR 247 (Old Woman Springs Rd.) east of the 4-way stop (i.e.: from 65 to 55 mph from the fire station to Camprock Rd.). The 65 mph zone induces much higher speeds on this stretch of highway where numerous right and left turn movements occur on major County collector roads.	Sill posted 65 MPH just east of Fire Station - to be changed to 55 MPH per previous meeting. Question remains as to the requirement for full stretch of a HWY to be posted the same speed limit.
SR-247	Left-turn pockets east of the 4-way stop at Post Office, Midway and Medanos Roads., and a right turn lane at Visalia Rd	County to look into doing a circulation study for the Lucerne Valley, focusing on areas of commercial development. May possibly be included in the General Plan Update

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority  
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 4

**Date:** November 17, 2006

**Subject:** Findings from the September 2006 Transportation Development Act Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearings

**Recommendation:\*** Adopt Resolution 07-004; Resolution of the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission Adoption of Unmet Transit Needs Findings for the Public Hearings held in September 2006.

**Background:** During September 2006 SANBAG, acting as the County Transportation Commission (Commission), held three public hearings for the Mountain/Desert Region in San Bernardino County in response to the Transportation Development Act (TDA) requirement to obtain testimony regarding unmet transit needs that can be reasonably met (PUC §99238 and 99401.5) by establishing or contracting for new public transportation or specialized transportation service or by expanding existing services. The first and second public hearings were held in Victorville and Crestline on September 18, 2006. The third public hearing was held in Joshua Tree on September 21, 2006. In addition to the public hearing testimony, the Commission accepted written and internet correspondence. The governing bodies of the Victor Valley Transit Authority, Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority and the Morongo Basin Transit Authority served as the hearing boards.

Attachment A is Resolution 07-004 that contains the formal findings from the public hearing process. Attachment B provides the definitions of "unmet transit

\*

*Approved*  
*Mountain/Desert Committee*

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Moved:*

*Second:*

*In Favor:*

*Opposed:*

*Abstained:*

*Witnessed:* \_\_\_\_\_

needs” and “reasonable to meet” adopted by the Commission as of September 2004. These definitions have been used to determine the recommended formal findings contained in Resolution 07-004. Attachment C provides a summary of the testimony received and the recommended staff response.

**Upper Desert Region:**

In general the testimony received in the Upper Desert Region related to the Victor Valley. There was one complaint in reference to the circuitous service to and from Barstow/Lenwood area. The recent decision to interline routes #3 and #4 was shown to be the most cost effective method to provide service for that particular area.

There were numerous comments on routing and proposed routing changes which would decrease service or eliminate service in certain areas, these proposed changes have been addressed in the VVTA Growth and Operational Study which will ensure that most areas not served will have alternative service options available. Comments in reference to service performance and operational difficulties were received and will be addressed in the Growth and Operational Study, where the primary objective is to improve the day to day service, returning to a 60 minute frequency and improving on time performance.

There were comments submitted in reference to the Service Performance of the Drivers, with sensitivity and training needs identified. SANBAG staff recommends VVTA accept offers of training assistance from various community resources representing persons with disabilities.

On time performance difficulties in reference to Direct Access service were mentioned and the recent installation of ITS applications should help resolve these issues. Concerns were expressed over the Direct Access Evaluator assessing ADA eligibility and at this time it is a recommendation that VVTA monitor and review the number and type of appeals heard and overturned by the appeals board as a way to evaluate its ADA eligibility contractor.

The discontinuation of the Down the Hill Commuter Service was addressed with a desire to reinstate this service for not only commuter services but to market the service for people with disabilities. It is again a recommendation for VVTA to implement a ticket subsidy program with Greyhound bus services for the Down the Hill services.

Recommendations were received to improve VVTA service and having service consumers more involved in decision making. SANBAG would like VVTA to consider implementing a "ghost rider/secret shopper" program (undercover rider) which would include written findings submitted to the General Manager and Board of Directors on a periodic basis.

Finally, it is recommended that the VVTA provide the necessary funding to implement the adopted recommendations from the Growth and Operational Study.

**Mountain Region:**

The testimony received in the Mountain Region included requests for service connecting Mountain communities with each other and with San Bernardino – this is being addressed with additional service scheduled pending completion of Caltrans slope stabilization project, expected by November 1, 2006.

Other comments included service to Victorville which was tried and discontinued due to low ridership, and service to Palm Springs where there is insufficient demand for dedicated service. Service to North Shore Road, Baldwin Lake area, and service connections will be addressed in the upcoming Operational Analysis to begin in early 2007.

It is recommended that MARTA provide the necessary funding to implement any adopted recommendations identified in the Operational Analysis.

**Lower Desert Region:**

The testimony received in the Lower Desert Region included a desire to increase service on weekends for both Highway Bus and Ready Ride. Routing issues were included in the comments asking to see changes to accommodate easier access to shopping, increased frequency of trips, and additional driver training to add value to the service. These comments will be addressed in the upcoming Operational Analysis. Ready Ride trip denials were mentioned with SANBAG recommending MBTA monitor trip denial data.

Overall comments received were complementary to not only the service in general but to the operational staff and drivers.

It is recommended that MBTA provide the necessary funding to implement any adopted recommendation identified in the Operational Analysis.

At this point in time, staff does not anticipate any significant changes to the formal findings contained in Resolution 07-004. At the Mountain/Desert Committee, staff will be able to report on the actions taken by PASTACC and the MBTA Board. Both the VVTA and MARTA Boards will consider the Resolution on November 21<sup>st</sup>. Should there be any changes to the Resolution as a result of the VVTA and/or MARTA Boards, staff will identify them in the agenda item that will be presented to the Board in December and place that item on the discussion calendar.

**Financial Impact:** This item has no direct impact on the adopted budget. The Commission is responsible for administering the Transportation Development Act funds for San Bernardino County, including conducting the unmet transit needs public hearings and adoption of formal findings in response to the testimony received. Funding for the expenses associated with this activity is provided for under Task 50207000 TDA Administration. The funding source is LTF Administration.

**Reviewed By:** The preliminary findings will be presented and recommended for adoption by the Public and Specialized Transportation Advisory and Coordinating Committee (PASTACC) on November 14<sup>th</sup>. The hearing board for the Lower Desert Region will be reviewing the findings for that area on November 16<sup>th</sup>. The Upper Desert Region and Mountain Region hearing boards will review the findings for those areas on November 21<sup>st</sup>. The Mountain/Desert Committee will review the findings contained in Resolution 07-004 on November 17<sup>th</sup>.

**Responsible Staff:** Michael Bair, Director of Transit and Rail Programs  
Beth Kranda, Transit Analyst

RESOLUTION NO. 07-004

RESOLUTION OF THE SAN BERNARDINO  
COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
ADOPTION OF UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS FINDINGS  
FOR HEARINGS HELD IN SEPTEMBER 2006

**WHEREAS**, the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission (SANBAG) is the designated transportation planning agency for San Bernardino County, and is therefore, responsible for the administration funds under the Transportation Development Act (TDA), as amended; and

**WHEREAS**, SANBAG had adopted definitions of "unmet transit needs" and "reasonable to meet" during its regular meeting of January 8, 2003 and adopted a modification to the definition of "reasonable to meet" on September 1, 2004; and

**WHEREAS**, SANBAG conducted three public hearings in September 2006 to obtain testimony regarding unmet transit needs in the Mountain/Desert region of San Bernardino County; and

**WHEREAS**, SANBAG has given consideration of the testimony received during the public hearing process pursuant to PUC Sections 99238 and 99401.5; input from the Public and Specialized Transportation Advisory and Coordinating Council (PASTACC), the advisory council established pursuant to PUC Section 99238; and adequacy of public and specialized transportation contained in the most recently adopted Regional Transportation Plan; and the analysis of potential alternative public and specialized transportation services that would meet all or part of the transit demand;

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Board of Directions of San Bernardino County Transportation Commission hereby finds that:

1. There are no unmet needs that can be reasonably met within the Upper Desert Region of San Bernardino county provided that Victor Valley Transit Authority:

A. Approve the necessary increased subsidy to implement the approved service changes or modifications addressed in the Victor Valley Growth and Operational Study completed in November 2006 and to be implemented in July 2007.

B. Provide funding for a fare subsidy program with Greyhound Intercity Bus Service from the Victor Valley to Barstow and San Bernardino in Fiscal Year 2006/2007.

2. There are no unmet transit needs that can be reasonably met within the Mountain Region of San Bernardino county provided that the Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority (MARTA):

A. Approve the necessary funding to implement any approved recommendations from the Operational Analysis to be completed in Fiscal Year 2006/2007.

3. There are no unmet transit needs that can be reasonably met within the Morongo Basin Lower Desert portion of San Bernardino County provided that the Morongo Basin Transit Authority (MBTA):

A. Approve the necessary funding to implement any approved recommendation from the Operational Analysis Study to be completed in Fiscal Year 2006/2007.

Approved by the Board of Directors of the San Bernardino County Transportation Commission at a regular meeting thereof held this 6<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2006.

*Approved  
Board of Directors*

*Date: December 6, 2006*

*Moved: Second:*

*In Favor: Opposed: Abstained:*

*Witnessed:*



**Definitions of "Unmet Transit Needs" and  
"Reasonable to Meet" adopted by the SANBAG Board  
of Directors on September 1, 2004**

**Unmet Transit Needs:** Unmet transit needs are any deficiency in the provision of public transit service, specialized transit service or private for-profit and non-profit transportation.

**Reasonable to Meet:** Reasonable to meet is a determination to be made based upon the following guidelines, performance and financial standards:

- A. Community acceptance** – The proposed service has community acceptance and support as determined by the Unmet Transit Needs public hearing record, the inclusion of adopted programs and plans, the adoption of governing board positions and other existing information.
- B. Timing** –
  - 1. The proposed service shall be in response to an existing rather than future need.
  - 2. The proposed service shall be implemented consistent with the timing for federal and state grant approval if such a grant is the most appropriate primary method of funding.
- C. Equity** – The proposed service shall:
  - 1. Not unreasonably discriminate against or in favor of any particular segment of the community.
  - 2. Not result in reduced service levels for other parts of the transit system that have equal or higher priority.
  - 3. Require a subsidy per passenger generally equivalent to 120% of similar services being operated within the first two full fiscal years of operation unless overriding reasons so justify.
- D. Cost effectiveness** – The proposed service shall:
  - 1. Not duplicate other existing transportation services or resources.
  - 2. Consider opportunities for coordinating among adjoining public entities or with private transportation providers and/or funding agencies in order to maximize existing resources (including financial) as well as legal or customary responsibilities of other entities such as social service agencies, religious organizations and schools.
  - 3. Not adversely affect the operator's ability to meet the required ratio of fare revenue to operating cost after two full fiscal years of operation.
  - 4. Meet a productivity level of 80% of the average number of passengers per hour for similar services being operated within the first two full fiscal years of operation unless overriding reasons so justify.
- E. Operational feasibility** – The proposed service must be safe to operate, including the operation of vehicles on adequately maintained roadways.

# Attachment C

Revised 10/26/06

## Unmet Public Transit Needs Hearing – Upper Desert Region

Mojave Desert AQMD Board Chambers

Victorville, California

September 18, 2006

Testimony	Response
<p><b>Routing – Stoddard Wells Road</b> Concerned about deleting of stop -- continuance of service (Rt. 41) to Stoddard Wells Rod is desired.</p> <p><i>George Brown, Victorville Vicky Solano, Victorville Gale Luckey, Victorville Shannon McCroskey, Rolling Start, San Bernardino</i></p>	<p>Routing to Stoddard Wells Road is being addressed in the <i>VTA Growth and Operations Study</i>. Service was never going to be eliminated from the Stoddard Wells area. Early research indicated that this area could be service with a taxi voucher system. After conducting a series of public input sessions directly at VTA transfer points, the consultants decided that there was more latent demand for service for Stoddard Wells than the earlier data suggested. As a result, the Stoddard Wells area is being readressed to provide scheduled bus route service, although slightly reduced and served by County Rt. #22.</p>
<p><b>Routing</b> - Riders concerned about proposed discontinuance of service to residential areas along Rt. # 43 expressed. - Concern about elimination of service to 7<sup>th</sup> and Lorene (Rt. 41). <i>Diane Gustafson, Victorville Shannon McCroskey, Rolling Start, San Bernardino</i></p>	<p>Areas not served under any changes proposed through the <i>VTA Growth and Operations Study</i> are likely to be served by a route deviation zone which would ensure that passengers have some type of alternative service.</p> <p>The area of 7<sup>th</sup> Street to Lorene on Rt. 41 will continue to be served.</p>
<p><b>Routing</b> Will Rt. #51 come down by apartments on Pebble Beach Drive with changes to the route structure? Concerned that services will be discontinued. <i>Mrs. Owen Russell, Victorville</i></p>	<p>The recommendations of the <i>VTA Growth and Operations Study</i> work to balance the competing goals of coverage versus on-time performance --. Balancing to reach many parts of the area versus keeping the buses running tightly in more defined areas to ensure on-time performance. In this case, when ridership was counted, there was 1 on and 3 off at Pebble Beach versus 5 on and 2 off at Hughes during the sample period.</p>
<p><b>Routing</b> Want bi-directional service to decrease times on the bus, shortening the ride. <i>Terri Martini Adelanto</i></p>	<p>Bi-directional service was examined as one alternative under the <i>Growth and Operations Study</i>. A portion of the loop will get bidirectional service (mostly from Village and Air Base to Seneca and Civic Drive), considering the new routing coming from Adelanto.</p>

Testimony	Response
<p><b>Routing</b></p> <p>Want to see services: Victorville - Jade &amp; La Mesa to Luna &amp; La Mesa; Victorville - Palmdale &amp; El Evardo to Diamond to Mojave; Hesperia - Pyrite &amp; Main and Pomona &amp; Malibu [off Escondido]. Would like to see extended bus services as potential rider is walking more and more.</p> <p><i>Kathy Luease Dennis, Via facsimile to SANBAG</i></p>	<p>The proposed route restructuring from the <i>Growth and Operations Study</i> attempts to balance schedule reliability with a lack of coverage. New route structures adopted will have to be reviewed to determine specific responses to these Victorville locations.</p> <p>The Study is recommending a deviation zone for the area south of Palmdale Road and west of Hwy. 395. This may be extended to a portion of the area north of Palmdale Road and west of Hwy. 395. In <b>Victor Valley area of Jade/LaMesa/Luna</b> - while that particular loop is proposed to be eliminated to Amethyst, it is not that far from the proposed route. The Palmdale and El Evardo to Diamond &amp; Mojave is an area to be considered for service in future years. <b>Hesperia</b> is considering a circulator to serve some portions of newly developed residential areas in later years, possibly three years from now.</p>
<p><b>Service Performance – Operational Difficulties</b></p> <p>Concerns about the current quality of service; complaints include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increasingly late, unreliable service</li> <li>- Buses never come by the stop or passing riders by at stops</li> <li>- Buses driving very slowly, particularly when going up hill.</li> <li>- Buses are breaking down.</li> <li>- Took bus 3 hours 45 minutes to travel from Cottonwood &amp; Euclalyptus to Stoddard Wells Road.</li> <li>- For an aging fleet, doing a pretty good job of getting the buses out and running; importance of good maintenance.</li> <li>- Problems with lift-deployment, particularly on the Direct Access buses. Not reliable.</li> </ul> <p><i>Diane Gustafson, Victorville Linda Churchill, Victorville Mrs. Owen Russell, Victorville Jermaine Brimage, Victorville Ruby Adams, Victorville George Brown, Victorville Terri Martini Adelanto</i></p>	<p>The Authority is acknowledging that there are issues related to service and equipment reliability and is taking steps to correct these.</p> <p>The primary objective of the <i>VVTA Growth and Operations Study</i> is the improvement of the day-to-day service, making changes necessary to return the service to a 60 minute frequency and ensuring that connections are reliably made and the overall on-time performance of the service improves. Study recommendations are likely to be presented in December 2006 to the VVTA Board; adopted recommendations are likely to be implemented in July 2007.</p>

## Attachment C

Testimony	Response
<p><b>Transit Service Provision</b> Transportation services are complex to offer and to ensure high quality service. Rural communities are particularly difficult. Bus stop issues require the cities to work with transit to prioritize improvements.</p> <p><i>John Anaya, Rolling Start, San Bernardino</i></p>	<p>Appreciate the recognition of transit's complexities.</p>
<p><b>Service Performance – Drivers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drivers are not taking enough time to help those passengers that need assistance.</li> <li>There doesn't appear to be enough supervision of drivers.</li> <li>Drivers need better training in working with passengers; greater sensitivity to ridership.</li> <li>Very rude driver on Rt. # 31 – mean and nasty.</li> <li>Driver training should include education by persons with disabilities who are consumers of the public transit services.</li> </ul> <p><i>Jermaine Brimage, Victorville</i>  <i>Diane Gustafson, Victorville</i>  <i>Shannon McCroskey, Rolling Start, San Bernardino</i>  <i>Terri Martini, Adelanto</i></p> <p><b>Community Resource on Accessibility</b> Speaker is experienced in working with coach operators around sensitivity training issues, on securement issues and in bus stop accessibility design issues. Offering a day of his time to travel with VVTA administrator around the service area and help to identify and prioritize accessibility concerns.</p> <p><i>John Anaya, Rolling Start, San Bernardino</i></p>	<p>Recommend that VVTA accept the offer of training assistance for VVTA operators, encouraging VVTA administrators and governing body to utilize these community resources as well other training resources. With implementation of the <i>Growth and Operations Study</i> recommendations, drivers may become more customer friendly as routes are returned to a "driveable" 60 minute headway.</p>
<p><b>Number of Mobility Devices on the Vehicle at One Time</b></p> <p>Rider was informed by the driver of a bus for which I had been waiting two hours due to missed connections, that she already had 3 mobility devices on the bus and couldn't take another one. Rider indicated she would "fold-up" her walker to ensure there was room to move down the aisle.</p> <p>Is there some way to have a first-of-the month courtesy bus or extra bus when the buses are so full?</p> <p><i>Diane Gustafson, Victorville</i></p>	<p>VVTA does have service vehicles available to supervisors for on-the-road difficulties. These could be used to assist passengers in such instances as that described by this individual. Particularly given the 60 to 70 minute headway of VVTA routes, this is important. Recommend establishing procedures to ensure that potentially stranded transit riders using mobility devices are transported by use of a service vehicle, if necessary, when demand on the existing vehicles' tie-down spaces are at capacity.</p>

Testimony	Response
<p><b>Commuter Down-the-Hill Service -- Reinstitute</b> Desires to see a return of the down-the-hill commute service, Victor Valley to San Bernardino. Commuter services left before the VVTA bus service began running each day. Designed to fail; three year test was not enough. There wasn't enough promotion of the service in the newspapers and other media.</p> <p><i>Linda Churchill, Victorville</i> <i>Diane Gustafson, Victorville</i> <i>Jermaine Brimage, Victorville</i> <i>Shannon McCroskey, Rolling Start, San Bernardino</i> <i>Rosella DeVore, Adelanto</i></p>	<p>The VVTA Board of Directors has established as its policy that it will not consider reinstituting commuter service at this time. Although ridership grew modestly over the three-year demonstration period, the average rider per trip rate was only 17 to 18 passengers per vehicle trip in the final year of the demonstration period. This translated to a monthly per rider subsidy of \$302.67 for the operating months of FY 04-05, the period when the service last operated.</p>
<p><b>Commuter Down-the-Hill Service -- Focus and Market to Persons with Disabilities</b> Interest in examining strategies to grow and improve down-the-hill services to persons with disabilities.</p> <p><i>John Anaya, Rolling Start, San Bernardino</i></p>	<p>This comment is referred to the <i>Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Coordinated Services Study</i> which will consider and develop recommendations on needs such as this to SANBAG, to the public transit operators and to San Bernardino County's human services providers. The target populations of this study are seniors, persons with disabilities and persons of low income.</p>
<p><b>Greyhound Bus Service: Barstow-Victorville-San Bernardino</b> Concerned about the frequency of the Greyhound buses, the timing of these and the cost. All needs improvement. Very challenging service to use by persons who are transit dependent.</p> <p><i>Diane Gustafson, Victorville</i> <i>Shannon McCroskey, Rolling Start, San Bernardino</i></p> <p>Twenty-two dollar Greyhound fare from Barstow round trip to Victorville is too expensive, even for a once monthly doctor's appt.</p> <p><i>Donna Gable, Lenwood</i></p>	<p>SANBAG strongly encourages VVTA to implement the Greyhound bus ticket subsidy program that is now in place in Barstow.</p> <p>Current Greyhound schedules and fares are: Buses southbound Barstow to Victorville - 9:55 a., 12:15 p., 1:10 p., 3:00 p., 3:55 p., &amp; 4:40 p. Buses northbound Victorville to Barstow - 11:56 a., 1:45 p., 3:35 p., 4:30 p., 5:15 p. Roundtrip fare = \$25 Buses southbound Victorville to San Bernardino - 11:56 a., 1:45 p., 3:35 p., 4:30 p. &amp; 5:15 p. Buses northbound San Bernardino to Victorville - 9:30 a., 12:15 p. &amp; 6:45 p. Roundtrip fare = \$29</p> <p>Barstow Greyhound discounted fares are: Roundtrip fares = \$22 regular adult, \$16.50 student; \$11 Senior, Disabled or Child Under Age 5.</p>

## Attachment C

Testimony	Response
<p><b>Bus Stop Improvements/ Sidewalks Needed/ Bus Shelters Needed</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Along Hesperia Road, it is a dirt sidewalk; paved sidewalk is needed both for safety and for accessibility.</li> <li>- Shelter on Hesperia Road near Chalon Road by Green Tree – no shelter or shade or seat. It is not safe.</li> <li>- Cut-outs needed at 2<sup>nd</sup> Street across from the Welfare Office. Also across from Seneca; no cut-outs there.</li> <li>- Annagosa Rd. (Rt. 52) by the Office Max / Best Buy Mall necessary to walk across a busy driveway. Difficult for those with mobility impairments who move slowly.</li> <li>- Annagosa and Seneca – improvements needed.</li> <li>- Bus stop inventory needed to provide information to riders on accessible and to direct improvements for stops.</li> <li>- In Apple Valley, can't walk down the side of Route 18.</li> <li>- In Adelanto at Verbena &amp; Joshua, need a bench or shelter</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"> <i>Linda Churchill, Victorville</i>  <i>Diane Gustafson, Victorville</i>  <i>Shannon McCroskey, Rolling Start, San Bernardino</i>  <i>George Brown, Victorville</i>  <i>Terri Martini, Adelanto</i> </p>	<p>SANBAG recommends VVTA continue its shelter/ bus stop lighting and accessibility program, particularly focused at the proposed point deviation locations. SANBAG will be issuing in November 2006 the biennial call for bus stop accessibility projects funded from 20% of the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Article 3 revenue, about \$800,000 available countywide.</p> <p>VVTA is required to spend 1% of its Federal funding under Section 5307 on enhancements which would include bus stop improvements. VVTA works with its member agencies to identify where bus stop improvements should be located. As cities are responsible for some significant portion of street and road improvements, such as sidewalks leading to bus stops, citizens are encouraged to stay in communication with city decision-makers and the Authority on prioritization of bus stop improvements.</p> <p>VVTA's existing bus stop inventory – simply listing stop characteristics but making no judgment as to levels of accessibility per the Americans with Disabilities rules – can be placed on the VVTA website. This tool, which is periodically updated as additional stop amenities are installed, can be a resource to riders. Even in a simple spreadsheet format, a working tool is likely to have value to riders.</p> <p>The Authority has apparently sent its existing bus stop inventory spreadsheet to a marketing firm for upload to VVTA's web site. In time, it may become possible to geocode stops and tie them in with a JPEG photo of each stop to post on VVTA's web site.</p>

## Attachment C

Testimony	Response
<p><b>Direct Access Operational Difficulties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Direct Access on-time performance difficulties;</li> <li>- Direct Access equipment in need of repair and maintenance.</li> </ul> <p><i>Diane Gustafson, Victorville</i>  <i>Rosella DeVore, Adelanto</i>  <i>Terri Martini Adelanto</i></p>	<p>VVTA has invested in computerized dispatching software, Trapeze, and this will enable closer monitoring of performance to identify and correct on-time performance difficulties.</p> <p>With the installation of Trapeze, and as the operator becomes more familiar with its extensive capabilities, dispatch is likely going to be able to provide better information to passengers, even those who call into a Sunday telephone message system when dispatch is closed.</p> <p>VVTA's operations contractor has decreased the mileage between maintenance inspections in order to ensure that necessary maintenance is performed at shorter intervals, thereby decreasing the number and frequency of vehicle breakdowns.</p>
<p><b>Direct Access Trip Reservation Process</b></p> <p>Calling on the Sunday night before a Monday trip request is a nice feature; problem is that if pick-up time must be modified for an early Monday morning trip, the rider isn't provided much notice (20 minutes in this instance) which is too short a time period for someone with disabilities who moves slowly in the morning.</p> <p><i>Diane Gustafson, Victorville</i></p>	<p>At this time, riders do need to be prepared, when placing a Sunday night trip reservation to accommodate the pick-up window of ten minutes before and thirty minutes after or the one hour ADA negotiation window for pick-up time of one hour on either side of the trip request time. These are significant lengths of time for a rider to potentially be available for pick-up, but the current system makes it difficult to do otherwise. This may be an area that VVTA can address as experience with the Trapeze software develops.</p>
<p><b>Direct Access Fares</b></p> <p>Don't mind paying a higher fare for service if it is a good ride, on time.</p> <p><i>Rosella DeVore, Adelanto</i></p>	<p>VVTA has indicated it is committed to improve service reliability and on time performance through use of the new Trapeze reservation and dispatch software, as well as the imminent installation of mobile display computers on all Direct Access vehicles.</p>
<p><b>Direct Access Evaluator</b></p> <p>Direct Access Evaluator needs to be retrained to develop a greater understanding of people's disabilities.</p> <p><i>Ruby Adams, Victorville</i></p>	<p>VVTA does contract with an outside eligibility analyst to assess ADA eligibility. Additionally there is an appeals process to ensure that consumers have a mechanism for review of decisions with which they disagree. VVTA is encouraged to monitor the number and type of appeals, as one mechanism of evaluating its ADA eligibility contractor. In December VVTA will move to a new web based and certification review process. The contractor will have health specialists qualified in the area of the applicant's disability to review their application.</p>

## Attachment C

Testimony	Response
<p><b>Measure I Funding</b></p> <p>Concerned that promises around the last election said that voting for Measure I would help, that transportation would get better – better service and better buses. This doesn't appear to be true. Services appear to be getting worse.</p> <p><i>Mrs. Owen Russell, Victorville</i></p>	<p>New Measure I becomes effective in 2010, called the Measure I extension. Victor Valley has a provision increasing 5% of revenues for Senior and Disabled Transit Service by 0.5% annually for five years, for a maximum of 7.5% of total funds collected. These funds will provide fare subsidies that control the fare pricing and provide support for transit service for elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities. The Measure I extension also provides for use of Local Street Project funds for transit purposes, including but not limited to fare subsidies and enhancements oriented to seniors and persons with disabilities.</p>
<p><b>Citizens Advisory Council / Representation on Board by Persons Using the Service</b></p> <p>Recommend that a citizens' advisory council be established to work towards improvements in VVTA's service. Challenge administrators and policy makers to use the buses for one week; decisions are <del>taken</del> made by persons who never ride the bus.</p> <p><i>Shannon McCroskey, Rolling Start, San Bernardino</i></p> <p>Recommend appointing someone to the board who uses public transportation and understands the dilemma of those using transit.</p> <p><i>Diane Gustafson, Victorville</i></p>	<p>The Authority is encouraged to consider a "secret shopper" or "ghost riders" initiative where a designated rider or riders prepare a written report to the general manager on selected qualities of a sample of rides, reporting on the ride experience. This would ensure a continuing rider perspective and voice within the program's administration. Although some informal ghost riders currently do provide input to VVTA administration, there may be ways in which VVTA can formalize this so that rider voices are an ongoing dimension of the service oversight.</p>
<p><b>Adelanto/ Helendale</b></p> <p>Wish to qualify for Direct Access trips to and from home between Adelanto and Helendale, approximately 12 miles outside of Helendale.</p> <p><i>Rosella DeVore, Adelanto</i></p>	<p>Public transit must focus its limited resources on areas where there is some density of ridership – it is not economically feasible for VVTA buses to travel out significant distances from the areas of some population density.</p>
<p><b>Wrightwood/ Pinon Hills</b></p> <p>Wrightwood direct area bus [probably Direct Access] bus is apparently no longer available. Adult son with disabilities has special needs and cannot navigate on his own to meet the bus at the Victorville Mall.</p> <p><i>Eva Malone, Wrightwood</i></p> <p>Was a bus rider of direct area bus but service no longer provided. Wants to see bus service returned to Pinon Hills.</p> <p><i>Gary Griffen, Pinon Hills</i></p>	<p>Tri-Community Route is route deviation service to the Wrightwood, Pinon Hills and Phelan communities with riders requesting a deviated pick-up with an advance reservation request. Some service was suspended during the summer due to Caltrans construction closing the roads; service is back to regular schedule now. The operation of vehicles on dirt roads is not feasible due to potential vehicle damage. Additional service needs that cannot be met with the Tri-Communities deviated fixed route may be served by the mileage reimbursement TREP program administered by DAAS.</p>



# Attachment C

Testimony	Response
<p><b>VVTA - Public Notice</b></p> <p>Concerned that Riders Alert about this hearing were not made available to the riders with sufficient notice (two days) and concerns items on the VVTA 5 Year Plan that were already discussed by the VVTA Board, namely appeared no longer open to public comment.</p> <p><i>Shannon McCroskey, Rolling Start, San Bernardino</i></p> <p>Concerned about the ability of those in outlying area to obtain transportation in order to attend public hearings and make comment into the public record.</p> <p><i>Diane Gustafson, Victorville</i></p>	<p>In the SANBAG cover letter to individuals and organizations announcing the hearing, it is clearly noted that testimony can be received in person at the public hearings, by surface mail, by email or by facsimile. Those communicating by mail, email or facsimile must include their home town in order for their comment to be entered into the public record. Notice on buses was provided in mid-August, on or around August 18<sup>th</sup>, when SANBAG issued its original notification of the hearing dates.</p>
<p><b>Barstow - Lenwood Area</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Circuitous service from and to Lenwood</li> <li>- Daily shuttle service desired between Barstow and the Outlet Mall</li> <li>- Would like to see fixed route service start earlier;</li> <li>- Calling daily for the All-Ride pick up is hard on families with kids.</li> </ul> <p><i>Donna Gabel [via letter], Lenwood</i></p>	<p>Routes #3 and #4 are circuitous because they are interlined. The interlining of Routes # 3 and #4 is the most cost-effective method of providing service to the greatest physical area. Service to the Outlet Mall continues on these routes with the first route starting at 7 a.m. and the last route leaving Building #9 at the Factory Merchants Mall at 6 p.m. Also, as the Outlet Mall is within the Barstow city limits, it is served by All-Ride until 11 p.m. when the last call can be made.</p> <p>All-Ride replaces fixed route service in some areas due to low ridership. This too is the most cost-effective method of serving lower ridership areas. It may be possible to set up, continuing advance request reservation with the All-Ride so daily calls aren't necessary.</p>

# Unmet Public Transit Needs Hearing – Lower Desert Region/ Morongo Basin

Morongo Basin Transit Authority

Joshua Tree, California

September 21, 2006

Testimony	Responses
<p><b>Weekend Service</b></p> <p>Desire for more service on the weekends, both Highway Bus and Ready Ride.</p> <p><b>Sundays</b> -- Could be very limited, just a four-hour day, and even run every other Sunday as a test with sufficient promotion, but just hitting the popular areas.</p> <p>Need to have lift service on Sundays. Would like to go to church.</p> <p><i>Gladys Arner, Yucca Valley</i>  <i>Arthur Jarrels, Lander</i>  <i>Mary Lou Almond, Yucca Valleys</i>  <i>Arthur Ayala, Yucca Valley</i>  <i>Marie Barr, Yucca Valley</i>  <i>Mikey Ibriani, Yucca Valley</i>  <i>Mary Venison, Joshua Tree</i>  <i>Gladys Armor, Yucca Valley</i>  <i>Joan Wilson, Joshua Tree</i></p> <p><b>Saturday</b> -- Would like to see Saturday service to get to the grocery store, pick up medications, run errands. Some work trips on Saturdays. Need Ready Ride on weekends as it is too far to walk to Highway Bus.</p> <p><i>Joyce Mone, Twentynine Palms submitting petition with 110 signatures</i>  <i>Pauline Kliebe, Yucca Valley</i>  <i>Gladys Armor, Yucca Valley</i></p>	<p>Sunday and weekend service between Yucca Valley and Twentynine Palm and the weekend shuttle bus, particularly Saturday service, will be referred to the <i>Operational Analysis</i> which will be undertaken early in 2007 to bring back recommendations on service improvements.</p>
<p><b>Bus Shelters / Bus Improvements</b></p> <p>Would like to see a shelter at Oleander Hotel, making this stop a safer place.</p>	<p>Continue bus stop improvement program, including shelters, benches lighting and accessibility. SANBAG will be issuing its biennial call in November 2006 for projects for the 20% of Local Transportation Funds</p>

# Attachment C

Testimony	Responses
<p>No restroom at the Stater Brothers bus stop. The benches there need to be cleaned; need volunteers.</p> <p><i>Gladys Arner, Yucca Valley</i></p> <p><i>Dick Perry, Yucca Valley</i></p>	<p>(LTF) Article 3 to improve access, making available a little over \$800,000 countywide. This will provide MBTA and the basin cities with additional resources to continue bus stop improvements.</p> <p>MBTA does have a full-time utility service worker that inspects and services each of MBTA's 48 shelters at least twice weekly. This includes emptying trash, wiping surfaces and cleaning graffiti. Shelters are steam cleaned once monthly. If there is a stop that is in need of particular attention, customers should advise MBTA customer service.</p>
<p><b>Driver Training</b></p> <p>Drivers pass up passengers and can be rude. Can add value to have driver training on showing respect and courtesy to riders.</p> <p><i>Arthur Jarrels, Landers</i></p> <p>The drivers have to put up with a lot of difficult passengers I would throw them off the bus. We commend the drivers for what they do and their strength; drivers need support. When drivers encounter difficulties on the buses, can they call the police?</p> <p><i>Arthur Ayala, Yucca Valley</i> <i>Mary DeVicente, Yucca Valley</i></p>	<p>SANBAG encourages sensitivity training and re-training of drivers. These comments are also referred to the <i>Operational Analysis</i> for review and consideration.</p> <p>MBTA just concluded an extensive review and planning activity for emergency situations. There are procedures in place for handling incidents on the bus, to ensure that appropriate assistance is requested promptly in the event of difficulties.</p>
<p><b>Routing</b></p> <p>Would like to see Route 3B (Twentynine Palms) improved, many nooks and crannies to the routing.</p> <p><i>Arthur Ayala, Yucca Valley</i></p> <p>Would like to see routing makes it easier to get to the grocery store (Tamarisk Road)</p> <p><i>Joyce Mone, Twentynine Palms</i></p> <p>Would like to see a stop closer to Park Avenue in Joshua Tree in connecting to the Palm Springs bus.</p> <p><i>Joan Wilson, Joshua Tree</i></p>	<p>These comments are referred to the <i>Operational Analysis</i> for review and consideration. Various routing suggestions will have to be reviewed in terms of their operational feasibility.</p>
<p><b>Highway Bus Frequency</b></p> <p>Would like to see buses every half hour on the Highway Bus.</p> <p><i>Harshadra Desai, Yucca Valley</i></p>	<p>This comment is referred to the <i>Operational Analysis</i> for review and consideration.</p>
<p><b>Ready Ride</b></p>	<p>The capacity of the Ready Ride service will be examined in the</p>

## Attachment C

Testimony	Responses
<p>- May need some assistance on the dial-a-ride. Sometimes they cannot book a ride.</p> <p>- Buses are running through the shopping centers and drivers need to assist persons with disabilities with packages. <i>Harshadra Desai, Yucca Valley</i></p>	<p><i>Operational Analysis</i> to identify times and frequency when trips cannot be booked, to understand what patterns of demand exist and how these might be better served.</p> <p>Current MBTA policy is for drivers to assist passengers with up to six small packages.</p>
<p><b>Service to Palm Springs</b></p> <p>Need more connections times on the Palm Springs runs. Can catch the 10:25 bus back but after that, have to wait until after 5 p.m. to get back. Need an earlier connection than after 5 p.m. <i>Mary Venison, Joshua Tree</i></p> <p>Propose a once monthly trip to Palm Desert Mall. <i>Kathy Schmidt, Joshua Tree</i></p>	<p>These Palm Springs connection comments are referred to the <i>Operational Analysis</i> for review and consideration.</p>
<p><b>Extended Services</b></p> <p>Would like to see a bus run once a month to the Casinos. <i>Mel Rofener, Yucca Valley</i></p>	<p>The service that MBTA runs into Palm Springs would allow transfer onto SunLine routes in order to get to some casinos in the Coachella Valley.</p>
<p><b>Medical Trips into Loma Linda and VA</b></p> <p>Demand for medical trips continues from the Morongo Basin into the medical facilities in the San Bernardino Valley, including the V.A., Loma Linda and Arrowhead Medical Center. These remain a difficult-to-meet need. <i>Atia Baig, Dept. of Aging and Adult Service</i></p>	<p>These comments related to inter-city bus services and coordination with the human services systems are referred both to the <i>Comprehensive Operations Analysis</i> and to the <i>Public Transportation-Human Services Coordinated Transportation Study</i> that is just beginning, December 2006. This later study will devise strategies and programs by which the public</p>

## Attachment C

Testimony	Responses
<p><b>Ready Ride Bus Passes and the TREP Program</b></p> <p>DAAS has been purchasing bus passes to provide to low income seniors and expects to continue to administer this Measure I program. This program fills an important need.</p> <p><i>Atia Baig, Dept. of Aging and Adult Services</i></p>	<p>transit and the human services agencies can better work together to meet these difficult-to-serve needs.</p>
<p><b>Service Complements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Complements to service, particularly drivers (Margaret)</li> <li>- Dispatch is excellent; very helpful.</li> <li>- It is a good to have such a system in the area.</li> <li>- Drivers make the buses a safe environment.</li> <li>- Appreciate the assistance the drivers offer, in boarding and with packages.</li> <li>- Appreciate that the service exists; really nice to see that the buses are available.</li> <li>- Grateful because no longer driving -- this gives independence.</li> <li>- Appreciative as she anticipates a time will come when she cannot drive; glad the service is available.</li> <li>- Everything about MBTA is great!</li> </ul> <p><i>Gladys Arner, Yucca Valley; Lillian Robbins, Yucca Valley Arthur Ayala, Yucca Valley; Blanche Dick, Yucca Valley Marie Bahr, Yucca Valley; Pauline Kliebe, Yucca Valley Harshudra Desai, Yucca Valley; Gladys Arnold, Yucca Valley Charlotte Miller, Twentynine Palms; Mary Venison, Joshua Tree Sandy Flack, Reach Out Morongo Basin, Yucca Valley</i></p> <p><i>Mel Rofner, Yucca Valley; Atia Baig, Dept. of Aging &amp; Adult Services</i></p>	<p>These comments are always nice to hear and will also be incorporated into the <i>Comprehensive Operations Analysis</i> to ensure that existing services and policies that are working well are not degraded or jeopardized by new service recommendations.</p>

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority  
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 5

**Date:** November 17, 2006

**Subject:** Measure I Victor Valley and Mountains Subarea Boundary Change

**Recommendation:**\* Make recommendation to the Jurisdictions of the Victor Valley and Mountains Subareas to Approve the Revised Measure I Subarea Boundaries.

**Background:** In both Measure I 1990-2010 and Measure I 2010-2040 the City of Hesperia is listed as a jurisdiction within the Victor Valley subarea. However, following the annexation of Rancho Las Flores, portions of City of Hesperia are no longer entirely located in the Victor Valley subarea; a portion of the City's southern city limits extends into the Mountains subarea.

While southern Hesperia is a largely rural area at this time, the City and developers intend to develop Rancho Las Flores into a master planned community. To avoid the complications that may arise as a result of urbanized areas of a City straddling Measure I subarea boundaries, staff recommends amending the Measure I subarea boundaries for the Victor Valley and the Mountains subareas to correct this issue. The revisions to the Mountains and Victor Valley subarea boundaries are provided in Attachment A. The map depicts both the current boundaries and the proposed new boundaries. In general, the new Measure I subarea boundaries for the Mountains and Victor Valley subareas follow SR-138, SR-173 and the City of Hesperia city limits.

\*

*Approved*  
*Mountain/Desert Committee*

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Moved:*

*Second:*

*In Favor:*

*Opposed:*

*Abstained:*

*Witnessed:* \_\_\_\_\_

MDC0611A-RPG  
50507000  
Attachment:  
MDC0611A1-RPG

The Measure I 2010-2040 Ordinance Section XIV, Line 4 states, "the boundaries of subareas shall be amended only by unanimous approval of all the jurisdictions in the subareas where an amendment is proposed to include or exclude territory." If the Mountain/Desert Committee recommends the modification to the Measure I subarea boundaries, the Victor Valley jurisdictions and the Mountain jurisdictions would need to independently approve the final boundary change. Staff would work with local jurisdiction staff to prepare a staff report and recommended action to take before their respective Councils for approval.

**Financial Impact:** This item has no financial impact to the SANBAG budget Adjustment of the proposed boundary will insure that revenue collected in the City of Hesperia will be attached for use in the Victor Valley subarea.. All staff activities are consistent with the adopted Budget, Task Number 50507000.

**Reviewed By:** This item is scheduled for review by the Mountain/Desert Committee on November 17, 2006.


**Responsible Staff:** Ryan Graham, Transportation Planning Specialist

Measure 1  
Victor Valley/Mountain  
Boundary Revision

HESPERIA

Legend

 Current Boundary

 Boundary Revision



- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority  
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

## *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 6

**Date:** November 17, 2006

**Subject:** Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan Policy Issues

**Recommendation:\*** Review and discuss white paper issues for furtherance of the Strategic Plan.

**Background:** The SANBAG Board of Directors approved working project cost factors and revenue projections on August 2, 2006. Because consideration of the Project Advancement element of the Measure I Strategic Plan Scope of Work was addressed separately, the next steps in strategic plan development are:

- 1) Development of project prioritization policies and procedures,
- 2) Evaluation of the need for and benefit of "frontloading" or advancing funding for selected programs through inter-program borrowing,
- 3) Further definition of the relationship of fair share development contributions to the fund allocation process, and
- 4) Definition of project development and delivery responsibilities for freeway interchange, major roadway, and grade separation projects.

\*

*Approved*  
*Mountain/Desert Committee*

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Moved:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Second:* \_\_\_\_\_

*In Favor:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Opposed:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Abstained:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Witnessed:* \_\_\_\_\_

The following White papers are attached on Measure I 2010-2040 Programs:

- the Cajon Pass Program,
- the Victor Valley Major Local Projects Program,
- the Rural Mountain/Desert Major Local Projects Program
- the Valley Freeway Program
- the Valley Freeway Interchange Program
- the Valley Major Streets Program
- the Valley Metrolink/Rail Program
- the Valley Express Bus/Bus Rapid Transit Program
- Bond Financing Debt Capacity
- Inter-Program Issues
- Legislative Issues

The White papers identify major technical and policy issues within each program associated with these elements of the scope of work, and alternative strategies to address them for detailed consideration by the policy committee with purview over each program. In addition, staff has developed white papers to address inter-programmatic issues (issues that affect multiple programs or may cause one program to affect others) that do not fit neatly into discussion of any one program, and Legislative issues that may affect or contribute to the success of the program.

Staff provided copies of all white papers to the membership of each committee and the Board of Directors as a whole for the October meetings.

Additional issues raised primarily the Administrative and Major Projects committee meetings included the following:

1. Is there a point at which we should go back to the voters for an additional increment of sales tax revenue for transportation, rather than cutting projects?
2. Should we review/establish SANBAG policy related to project enhancements vs original scopes of projects to insure that the projects constructed first do not consume funds required for projects to be constructed later?

3. With current escalation of construction costs, should we develop a spend-down strategy that analyzes the cost of bonding vs the cost of delayed construction?
4. What are the potential opportunities and challenges related to Public/Private partnerships for SANBAG projects?
5. Should SANBAG be "doing the heavy lifting" related to development mitigation rather than each jurisdiction fighting the battle independently?
6. Will there be sufficient funding to meet all of the needed local and arterial road improvements with the new Measure?
7. Can SANBAG orchestrate a regional lobbying strategy that utilizes the skills and relationships of its elected officials to lobby for federal and State funding to mitigate the impacts of goods movement in San Bernardino County? Can SANBAG develop a fact sheet on the local costs to San Bernardino County related to mitigation of goods movement impacts?

These questions and issues were a subject of some discussion at the October Plans and Programs Committee. Also presented at the Plans and Programs Committee was a preliminary reassessment of the levels of state and federal funding that were assumed to be available during 2010-2040 to contribute to delivery of the Measure I 2010-2040 programs. Assuming protection of Proposition 42 funds and various estimates of state and federal transportation revenue growth, the amount originally assumed in the Expenditure Plan, \$1.1 billion, could be increased by \$1.4 billion to \$3.0 billion. It is expected that these additional funds, like those previously assumed to be available, would be directed primarily to freeway and freeway interchange projects throughout the county, and could contribute significantly toward closing the previously-discussed funding gap created by the rapid cost escalation experienced during the 2003-2005 period. Receipt of state and federal funds in those amounts, however, will require vigilance and leadership on SANBAG's part.

Due to the extent of discussions of the issues and white papers at the Policy committee meetings in October, the discussions have been scheduled to continue at the November Policy committee meetings. Based on the white papers, staff will attempt to frame the issues on which policy direction is required and suggest policy alternatives. Ultimately, each committee will be asked to develop

recommendations on the programs or issues within its purview. Staff proposes to then return to the Plans and Programs Committee for continued discussion and policy development on the complete spectrum of issues, with consideration of the input by the policy committees responsible for the various individual programs.

Following is a list of issues and comments from the discussion at the Mountain/Desert Committee meeting in October 2006:

- **Could Needles pledge revenue from Measure I 2010-2040 to complete the Needles Highway?** Comment: Bonding for highway improvements is being considered as part of the strategic planning process. An issue paper has been developed, and the SANBAG Administrative Committee is closely considering bonding options. Revenue projections for the Colorado River Subarea need to be analyzed with respect to the total project cost and debt service. Jurisdictions in the Colorado River Subarea (the County and Needles) will need to agree on use of the Major Local Highway Project Funds, and perhaps commitment of local funds.
- **Smaller Mountain/Desert jurisdictions may not want to be part of the SANBAG Nexus Study, as they require flexibility to meet their unique needs.** Comment: Although most rural Mountain/Desert jurisdictions have or are currently in the process of adopting development fees, there is no requirement in Measure I 2010-2040 for Mountain/Desert jurisdictions outside the Victor Valley to participate in the SANBAG Nexus Study. Rural Mountain/Desert jurisdictions do have the options, at their discretion, to be included in the development mitigation program. Rural Mountain/Desert jurisdictions may want to weigh the benefits/burdens of participating in the development mitigation program compared to the requirements for Traffic Impact Analysis Reports and obligations under the SANBAG Congestion Management Program.
- **How will projects be prioritized for receipt of Major Local Highway Projects Funds?** Comment: Measure I 2010-2040 specifies that "Expenditure of Major Local Highway Projects funds shall be approved by the Authority Board of Directors, based upon a recommendation of subarea representatives and the Mountain/Desert Committee." Principles related to prioritization of projects are an expected outcome of the strategic planning process.

- **A final determination on realignment of US-395 needs to be made once and for all so that appropriate planning for future traffic demand can be accomplished.** Comment: On October 4, 2006, the SANBAG Board approved the contract for completing CEQA clearance on US-395 realignment through the Victor Valley. At the conclusion of the contract in March 2008, it is anticipated that sufficient information will be available to determine the feasibility of US-395 realignment.

The next workshop will be scheduled as appropriate to consider recommended approaches to the policy issues outlined above and discussed within the white papers. Members of the Board of Directors with interest in a particular program but not on the policy committee with purview over that program are encouraged to attend the committee meetings in an unofficial capacity.

**Financial Impact:** This item is consistent with the approved Fiscal Year 2006-2007 Budget.

***Reviewed By:*** This item will be reviewed by the Administrative Committee on November 8, the Major Projects Committee on November 9, the Plans and Programs Committee on November 15, the Commuter Rail Committee on November 16, and the Mountain-Desert Committee on November 17, 2006.

**Responsible Staff:** Ty Schuiling, Director of Planning and Programming  
Darren Kettle, Director of Freeway Construction  
Deborah Barmack, Director of Management Services  
Mike Bair, Director of Transit and Rail Programs  
Terry McGuire, Chief Financial Officer

**Name of Program:** Cajon Pass Program

**Brief description:** Measure I 2010-2040 requires that three percent (3%) of the revenue generated in the San Bernardino Valley Subarea and the Victor Valley Subarea be reserved in advance of other allocations for the Cajon Pass Account for funding of the I-15/I-215 Interchange in Devore, I-15 widening through Cajon Pass, and truck lane development. Cajon Pass serves as the major transportation corridor connecting the two urbanized areas within San Bernardino County and is in need of the identified improvements. These improvements are critical components to intra-county travel for residents of both the Victor Valley and San Bernardino Valley.

**Technical issues:**

In February 2006 the Board of Directors approved the final report for the Interstate 15 Comprehensive Corridor Study. The Study contemplated major transportation investments along the I-15 Corridor from SR 60 to D Street in northern Victorville. Included in the final report were recommendations to proceed with further analysis on two alternatives, dedicated tolled truck lanes and managed (moveable barrier) tolled auto lanes. The I-15 Corridor Study limits extend well beyond the limits of the Cajon Pass Program, the limits of the Cajon Pass program extend from the I-15/I-215 Devore Interchange to Cajon Summit, thus requiring consideration of how the Cajon Pass program fits within the overall I-15 Corridor program.

As part of the Board action approving the final report SANBAG staff was directed to investigate financing options to accelerate one component that was included in both the I-15 Corridor study and is eligible for funding from the Cajon Pass Program, that project being the reconstruction and realignment of the I-15/I-215 Devore Interchange. In August 2006 the Board approved in concept loaning current Valley Major Project funds to the future Cajon Pass program in order to fund project development activities for this project. Staff anticipates requesting the Board to authorize releasing a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Document development by the end of 2006 with project development work expected to commence in early 2007.

The most glaring technical issue facing the Cajon Pass program is the issue of available funding versus project cost. The Cajon Pass Program as originally proposed to County voters estimated a total Measure I fund availability of \$170 million and State and Federal revenues of \$60 million for a total of \$230 million. Recent estimates for the I-15/I-215 Devore Interchange project exceed \$200 million alone and the current estimate to for an additional lane in both directions on the I-15 through the Cajon Pass is \$ 270 million.

**Policy considerations and alternatives:**

- 1) *Project Acceleration* – The Board has approved loaning funds between the two Measures in order to continue progress on project development activities for the I-15/I-215 Devore Interchange identified in Cajon Pass program. This action will allow preliminary engineering and environmental clearance activities to proceed in advance of new Measure I revenues being available. Design-Build procurement is another tool that could be used to accelerate the Devore Interchange project. The Board's adopted Legislative Program supports the use of Design-Build procurement for transportation projects but a change in state law will be required to allow for Design-Build for freeway projects.
- 2) *Linkages to the Valley Freeway Program and Victor Valley Major Projects Program* – The I-15 Comprehensive Corridor Study clearly shows that while the Cajon Pass projects are necessary to relieve congestion on this major corridor, additional freeway lane capacity will also be required on the I-15 from SR 60 to the Devore Interchanges (a project identified in the Valley Freeway program) and from Cajon Summit to D Street in north Victorville (a project identified in the Victor Valley Major Projects Program). Any discussion that takes place relative to the I-15 freeway mainline improvements through the Cajon Pass must be done in conjunction with the overall I-15 Corridor.
- 3) *Funding availability* – In September 2006 the Board approved a revised Measure I 2010-2040 revenue estimate of \$8 billion, up from \$6 billion in 2004. Based on the revised revenue estimate

**Name of Program:** Victor Valley Major Local Highway Projects

**Brief Description:** In the Mountain/Desert subareas, 70% of revenue generated is preserved for Local Street Projects. The Measure I Expenditure Plan for each Mountain/Desert subarea specifies that 25% of Measure I revenues collected in each subarea be set aside for Major Local Highway Projects. Eligible projects for the Major Local Highway Projects category include "major streets and highways serving as primary routes of travel within the subarea, which may include State highways and freeways." The Plan also states that these funds can be used to "leverage other State and Federal funds . . . and to perform advance planning/project reports."

**Technical issues:** The Measure I Expenditure Plan estimated that the total amount of funds collected in the Victor Valley Major Local Highway Projects category over the thirty year period would be \$213m. Although this amount is considerably higher than other Mountain/Desert Subareas, the magnitude of transportation needs and cost of major facility construction render this amount woefully insufficient. Revised revenue estimates by subarea are under development and will provide an improved estimate of available revenue throughout the term of the Measure. Although Victor Valley revenue is expected to increase, it is doubtful that the imbalance between needs and available funding will be changed.

In the Victor Valley subarea, it was never anticipated that the Major Local Highway Projects category would fully fund any projects. Although projects were named in the Measure, the named projects were examples of major projects which were easily identified as priorities at the time the Measure was drafted. The projects listed were examples and not intended to represent a comprehensive list for this category. Language in the Expenditure Plan specifically stated these funds would be used as **"Contributions to Projects, including but not limited to:"**

The Expenditure Plan also contained an estimate of \$39m in State and Federal funds which would be available to the Victor Valley subarea. This estimate, however, cannot be relied upon considering the shortcomings of transportation funding at both the State and Federal level.

The Victor Valley is distinctly different from other Mountain/Desert subareas in two specific ways. The incorporated areas and surrounding county areas were included in the SANBAG Nexus Study which requires a fair share contribution by new development to transportation projects. It is also distinctively different in that there are two new major freeway corridors proposed in the subareas; i.e., High Desert Corridor (E-220) estimated to cost \$640m and US-395 estimated to cost \$670m.

The Nexus Study for the Victor Valley indicates the following cost and fair share contributions from new development in the Victor Valley:

Improvement Category	Total Cost	Development Contribution*
High Desert Corridor (E-220)	\$ 640m	\$ 0
US-395	\$ 670m	\$ 0
SR-138 West	\$ 81m	\$ 0
I-15 Widening	\$ 398m	\$ 0
Interchanges	\$ 268m	\$ 146m
Arterials	\$ 586m	\$ 294m
Grade Separations	\$ 32m	\$ 8m

\*Amounts include 2006 cost escalation factor of 12.9%)

Due to the lack of specifically identified projects and the vagaries of the amount of "contributions" from the Major Local Highway Projects category, project prioritization and allocations from the Major Local Highway Projects category are left to future policy determinations.

**Name of Program:** Rural Mountain/Desert Major Local Highway Projects

**Brief Description:** In the rural Mountain/Desert subareas, the overriding principle was that the highest transportation need and priority were in local street improvements. This is demonstrated by the 70% of revenue categorized for this purpose. The Measure I Expenditure Plan for each of the Mountain/Desert subareas also includes a category of funding for Major Local Highway Projects. (The issues related to this category of funding in the Victor Valley are substantially different and are addressed in a separate issue paper.) The Major Local Highway Projects category receives of 25% of Measure I revenues collected in each subarea. Eligible projects for this category of funds include "major streets and highways serving as primary routes of travel within the subarea, which may include State highways and freeways." The Plan also states that these funds can be used to "leverage other State and Federal funds . . . and to perform advance planning/project reports."

**Technical issues:** The total amount of funds collected in this category over the thirty year period is relatively small compared to the cost of construction for major highway improvements; i.e.; North Desert \$24m, Mountains \$30m, Morongo Basin \$31m; and Colorado River \$15m. Revised revenue estimates by subarea are under development. However, it is safe to say that anticipated revenue in this category may be in the neighborhood of \$1m a year or less.

Due to the vast areas and many miles of major local highways in these subareas areas, it was never anticipated that these funds would fully fund any project/s. Although projects were named in the Measure, the named projects were examples of major projects which were easily identified as priorities at the time the Measure was drafted. The project lists were not intended to provide a specific project list for the term of the Measure. Language in the Expenditure Plan specifically stated these funds would be used as "**Contributions to Projects, including but not limited to:**"

Estimates of an amount of State and Federal funds available to each subarea were included in the Expenditure Plan. These estimates, however, cannot be relied upon considering the shortcomings of transportation funding at both the State and Federal level.

Due to the lack of specifically identified projects and the vagaries of the amount of "contributions" from the Major Local Highway Projects category, project prioritization and allocations from the Major Local Highway Projects category are left to future policy determinations.

#### **Policy Considerations and alternatives:**

Considering the limited financial resources in the Major Local Highway Projects category, a number of policy decisions will be required in establishing principles for allocation of funds. It is possible that some criteria could be established which apply to all Rural Mountain/Desert subareas. However, it is certain that representatives of each subareas will be required to establish allocation principles which best fit the needs of their each subarea. Some of the policy considerations are:

- 1) *What criteria should be used to establish eligibility for allocation of funds from the Major Local Highway Projects category?* (State highway improvements only? Arterials spanning multiple jurisdictions? Projects which can demonstrate improved performance of general traffic circulation throughout the subarea? Project readiness?)
- 2) *How are the limited funds in Major Local Highway Projects category allocated?* (Full funding of projects on first-ready, first build basis? Percentage of project by phase? Percentage of construction only? Maximum amount per project? Percentage of funds generated on annual basis? Reservation of funds for limited number of specifically identified projects? Allocation based upon amount of additional funds leveraged? Allocation based upon performance measurements and/or assessment of benefit to all jurisdictions within the subarea?)



**Name of Program:** Valley Freeway Program

**Brief description:** Measure I 2010-2040 requires 29% of revenue collected in the San Bernardino Valley Subarea fund freeway projects within the San Bernardino Valley Subarea. Projects to be constructed with Freeway Projects funds include the widening of the following freeways:

- I-10 HOV – Milliken Avenue to Riverside County Line
- I-15 – Riverside County Line to I-215
- I-215 – Riverside County Line to I-10
- I-215 – SR 210 to I-15
- SR 210 – I-215 to I-10
- HOV Connectors

*Note: The Interstate 215 project through San Bernardino and Interstate 10 Westbound Lane addition down the Yucaipa grade is expected to be fully funded from current Measure I funds.*

**Technical issues:**

- 1) *Project Initiation Documents* – With the exception of the I-215 widening north of the SR 210 interchange and the HOV connectors, all of the projects listed above have had some level of project development work underway.
- 2) *Preliminary Engineering* – Preliminary engineering (the effort required to get a project to 30% design) is underway on the I-215 widening between Riverside County Line and I-10. The Board has conceptually approved proceeding with preliminary engineering for the I-10 widening.
- 3) *Environmental Clearances* – Work is underway on the Environmental Impact Report/Statement for the I-215 widening between Riverside County Line and I-10. The preliminary Project Study Report for the I-10 HOV projects prepared by Caltrans suggests that a Categorical Exception/Exclusion with studies will be the required environmental document. Various levels of environmental analysis will be necessary for all projects identified above with timeframes ranging from 2-6+ years.
- 4) *Final Design* – SANBAG or Caltrans – In the past 5 years or so the SANBAG Board has encouraged staff to pursue lead agency status for the purpose of final design of major freeway projects. It is assumed that this will continue as SANBAG's preferred approach for design activities. It is anticipated that SANBAG will continue to use engineering/design consultants rather than increasing internal staffing to perform this work.
- 5) *Unknowns of project complexity until preliminary engineering/environmental is underway* – The preliminary engineering phase of project development includes a variety of studies, the results of which lead to an ultimate project scope. Studies such as geotechnical/seismic, noise, traffic/system operations, endangered species, right of way, historic properties etc., are necessary element of project development but until these studies are complete it is difficult to truly scope the projects and the total costs associated with the projects.

**Policy considerations and alternatives:**

- 1) *Project Acceleration* – The Board has approved loaning of funds between the two Measures in order to continue progress on project development activities for the I-10 HOV Project identified in Measure I 2010-2040. This action will allow preliminary engineering and environmental clearance activities to proceed in advance of new Measure I revenues being available. The Board's adopted Legislative Program supports the use of Design-Build procurement for transportation projects but a change in state law will be required to allow for Design-Build for freeway projects.
- 2) *Linkages to Valley Freeway Interchange Program* – A number of Valley Freeway Projects will require either early or concurrent construction of antiquated and heavily congested local freeway interchanges. Given the limited resources available and the potential of over a \$1 Billion of

**Name of Program:** Freeway Interchange Projects

**Brief description:** Measure I 2010-2040 requires 11% of revenue collected in the Valley Subarea shall fund Freeway Interchange Projects. There are 31 Freeway Interchange Projects identified in the Measure and language intended to allow for additional interchange projects to be funded from this category. Language is also included in the Measure requiring equitable geographic distribution of projects be taken into account over the life of the program.

**Technical issues:**

The technical issues associated with the freeway interchange program will vary from interchange to interchange. In nearly all instances environmental clearances will likely require the preparation of an Initial Study/Environmental Assessment, a process that currently take an average of 2-3 years. As the interchange projects have direct interface with the freeway system both Caltrans and in most cases the Federal Highway Administration, will have a substantial role in all phases of the project.

There are two programmatic fundamental technical/structural questions that will affect the freeway interchange program that will only be answered through healthy policy debate and the two may very well be in conflict given the reality of the overall funding picture for freeway interchange projects. **First**, Measure I 2010-2040 requires a development contribution to freeway interchange projects and it has not yet been determined when SANBAG would be required to make Measure I Interchange program funds available to a project. **Second**, and potentially in conflict with the easy answers to the first question is how the Interchange program and Valley Freeway Program interface particularly if mainline freeway project acceleration remains a policy priority.

**Policy considerations and alternatives:**

- 1) *Project Acceleration* – The Board has approved loaning funds between the two Measures in order to continue progress on project development activities for the I-10 HOV Project identified in Measure I 2010-2040. This action will allow preliminary engineering and environmental clearance activities to proceed in advance of new Measure I revenues being available. Additionally, to maintain an accelerated schedule, several of the freeway interchange reconstructions must be complete before construction of the mainline HOV project commences. Recent actions by the United State Fish and Wildlife Service have cleared the substantial hurdle of addressing endangered species issues along this corridor so long as mitigation (habitat) is purchased. In general for freeway interchange projects to be delivered in an accelerated fashion design-build procurement may be a viable option. The Board's adopted Legislative Program supports the use of Design-Build procurement for transportation projects but a change in state law will be required to allow for Design-Build for freeway projects.
- 2) *Linkages to Valley Freeway Program* – A number of Valley Freeway Projects will require either early or concurrent construction of antiquated and heavily congested local freeway interchanges. Given the limited resources available and the potential of over a \$1 Billion of freeway construction in the first decade of the new Measure, it may be necessary to require freeway interchange project funds be made available first to those projects that affect mainline freeway construction.
- 3) *Funding availability* – Freeway interchange reconstructions are predominately funded from two sources; Measure I and Development impact fees as determined by the SANBAG Nexus Study program. The gap between projected revenues and estimated projects costs, while not as significant as that of the Valley Freeway program, is still substantial. More complicated perhaps than the potential gap in funding is the likelihood that local jurisdictions will have their local/developer contribution available and it will be incumbent upon SANBAG to make available the Measure I share to the project. This will likely lead to the policy discussion of whether long term financing should also be used for Freeway Interchanges and may shape how the Board might prioritize funding for interchanges vis-à-vis' the desire to accelerate mainline freeway projects.

**Name of Program:** Valley Major Streets Program

**Brief Description**

The Measure I 2010-2040 Expenditure Plan defines eligible Major Streets program projects as "congestion relief and safety improvements to major streets that connect communities, serve major destinations, and provide freeway access." Funding from this program "shall be expended pursuant to a five-year project list to be annually adopted" by SANBAG "after being made available for public review and comment. Funding priorities are improving roadway safety, relieving congestion, street improvements at rail crossings, and shall take into account equitable geographic distribution over the life of the program. Pursuant to Section VIII of the Measure I 2010-2040 Ordinance and the Board-approved Congestion Management Program, eligibility to receive funding from this program is also limited to those major street projects and street improvements at railway crossings for which fair share contributions have been calculated through SANBAG's approved Nexus Study.

**Technical issues**

The Measure I Valley Major Streets Program is to be funded by a combination of Measure I, federal, and fair share mitigation funds (opportunities, constraints, linkage with other programs). The Measure I share of total funding will initially be 20% of Valley revenue, but will be reduced to 17% or less after ten years commensurate with increased funding for the Express Bus/Bus Rapid Transit Service Program. Estimated Measure I revenues (based on \$8 billion total revenue) are \$1.079 billion. In addition, the Measure I 2010-2040 Expenditure Plan identifies \$82 million in state and federal funds and \$444 million in contributions from new development to fund this program. The updated Nexus Study fair share contribution for these projects is \$616 million, for an estimated available revenue total of \$1.777 billion. The updated cost of the eligible projects is \$1.798 billion, for a small programmatic shortfall of \$21 million. Annual Measure I revenue generation is projected to increase from about \$24 million in the first years to about \$58 million by 2040. Linkages between the eligible arterials and freeway interchanges may mean that the timing of projects funded through this programs may be affected by timing of projects funded through the Interchange Program.

**Policy considerations and alternatives**

- 1) "Frontloading" (borrowing from one or more other funding programs to advance projects in another programmatic category, with later repayment to the lender programs) of this or other programs may be deemed desirable by the Board of Directors and member jurisdictions. Current discussion suggests that other programs such as Valley freeways, interchanges, or rail are more likely candidates for frontloading than Major Streets, in which case Major Streets could become a donor program in the early years of the Measure. It appears likely, however, that some Valley jurisdictions consider the Major Street program to be more important in the near term than freeway improvements:
  - Option 1: No inter-program loans; all funds maintained for early delivery major street and grade separation projects.
  - Option 2: Cap loans to other programs at a level that permits limited delivery of major street and grade separation projects from the outset of the program.
  - Option 3: Unlimited loans to other programs with provision for later payback.
- 2) Selected grade separations may deserve priority over most arterial street improvements, but are also more likely to attract funding from sources not contemplated in the Expenditure Plan. They are also more likely to be federalized projects (require NEPA clearance in addition to CEQA clearance). Should the arterial street projects be given some degree of preference over grade separations for expenditure of Measure I 2010-

**Name of Program:** Metrolink/Rail Service

**Brief Description:** Measure I 2010-2040 requires 8% of Valley Measure I shall funds passenger rail projects, including the extension of the Metro Gold Line to Montclair, the implementation of passenger rail service between San Bernardino and Redlands and for the Metrolink system, the purchase of additional passenger cars and locomotives, construction of additional track capacity, construction of additional parking at stations and provide match funds for State and Federal revenues used for maintaining equipment, track and signal and road crossings.

**Technical issues:** The Metrolink/Rail Service Program is to be funded by a combination of Measure I, federal, state and local funds. Over the 30-year period, Measure I will generate nearly \$487 million. Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds (Sections 5307 - Fixed Guideway, 5309(m)(2)(A) New Starts and Small Starts, and 5309(m)(2)(B) - Rail Modernization) are expected to total \$479 million. This estimate of FTA revenue assumes that 50% of the capital cost for the Gold Line and Redlands extensions will be awarded (\$122.5 million). The proportion of San Bernardino Valley local revenue (Local Transportation Funds, State Transit Assistance Funds and Rail Asset funds) required for supporting the passenger rail program is not set in stone and will vary from year to year.

Both the Metro Gold Line and Redlands extensions, if everything falls in line, could be completed within the first four years of the new Measure I Program. Without other revenue sources being available, this could require a Measure I Rail commitment of \$122.5 to match a like amount of FTA funds. Only about \$40 million in Rail revenue will be generated in those four years. Staff has attempted to utilize as much of other revenue (local and CMAQ) that might be available to support these two important projects. Even with the reasonable use of other revenues, the amount of Measure I Rail funds required will total more than \$63.8 million; \$23.8 million more than the revenues generated.

**Policy considerations and alternatives:**

- 1) Both the Metro Gold Line and Redlands extensions have strong public and political support. It will be critical for SANBAG to continue to be a strong supporter of the Gold Line extension to Montclair and to leverage other Federal, State and local (Los Angeles County) funds as they become available.
- 2) Currently, cities along both projects appear to be supportive of transit oriented development at the proposed station locations; thus supporting the SCAG 2% Compass program.
- 3) The Gold Line extension is proposed as a design/build project. The Redlands extension could become a design/build project as well.
- 4) There are still several steps that need to be taken for both of these projects to win FTA approval to enter into preliminary engineering. For the Gold Line extension the major step includes a new travel forecast provided by LACMTA and getting project in Long Range Transit Plan. For the Redlands extension, the requirements for Small Starts are still not final, but the interim regulations will require the following prior to FTA authorization for Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Clearance:
  - A. Alternatives Analysis Report
  - B. Selection of LPA
  - C. Agreement of Baseline Alternative (FTA concurrence)
  - D. Planned ridership, cost inputs and estimates
  - E. Identification of transit rider benefit (travel forecast)
  - F. Economic Development Impacts
  - G. Transit Supportive Land Use and Future Patterns
- 5) Methods of advancing the two rail extension projects:

**Name of Program:** Express Bus/Bus Rapid Transit Service

**Brief Description:** Measure I 2010-2040 requires that 2% of Valley Measure I shall fund the Express Bus/Bus Rapid Transit Service category. Effective 10 years following the initial collection of revenue, this category amount shall increase to at least 5% and may increase to no more than 10% upon approval by the Authority Board. Assuming that the 5% is selected for the remaining 20 years, approximately \$206.6 million would become available. The implementation of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) will require federal funding from either the Federal Transit Administration Section 5309 New Starts or Small Starts programs.

**Technical issues:** In July 2004 Omnitrans developed a System-Wide BRT Corridor Plan that identifies 7 potential corridors. Of these seven corridors, the "E" Street corridor (from north of Cal State University to the VA Hospital in Loma Linda) was selected for early implementation. In December 2005 Omnitrans completed the alternatives analysis of the "E" Street corridor and selected a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) and is now seeking authorization to begin Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Clearance phase. The preliminary cost estimate for the LPA is \$156.2 million in 2005 dollars. The anticipated implementation date is the end of 2010.

**Policy consideration and alternatives:**

Clearly, the implementation schedule noted above would require a funding commitment prior to the Measure I 2010-2040 taking effect. One of the arguments given for not increasing the amount of new Measure I revenue to this category was that some of the infrastructure improvements required would be eligible under the Valley Major Streets program. Approximately \$45.6 of the estimated cost could be eligible for funding from the Valley Major Streets program; leaving a balance of \$110.6 million from other sources. It may be possible that the amount of federal funding could be as high as 80%, but a more likely amount would be 50%. So the amount of local funds necessary could range from \$12.2 to \$55.3 million. On a pay-as-you-go basis, it would take between 6 and 13 years to accumulate that amount of revenue under this program.

- 1) Should the BRT fixed guideway portion, excluding the dedicated bus bridge over I-10, of the project be consider for Valley Major Streets funding? And how should the BRT project be rated against other pressing needs for the Valley Major Streets program funds?
- 2) Should the funding for the BRT project be included in an advance bonding scenario?
- 3) Should there be a subset of this program funding to support future express bus service?

**Recommendation:** To be developed through committee discussion.

**Responsible Staff:** Mike Bair, Director of Transit and Rail Programs

D E A T

**Name of Program:** New Measure I Bond Financing Debt Capacity

**Brief Description:** The New Measure I Bond Financing Program will provide funding for capital project construction that is not expected to be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis. The program could be divided into a first/senior lien program that is primarily used to finance major projects (freeways, interchanges, and possibly passenger rail and major arterials) and a second/junior lien program that is used for local streets, and possibly major arterials. Debt capacity for the program is dependent upon many factors and constraints that are not known at this time, primarily future sales tax revenues, interest rates and the amortization period of the debt. It is reasonable to expect that the overall debt capacity for the new Measure I program could range between \$600-\$800 million in the first five years of the program (composed of \$500-\$700 million of 1<sup>st</sup> lien bonds and \$100-\$200 million of 2<sup>nd</sup> lien bonds).

**Technical Issues:** The program must be structured to meet all of the allocation/distribution requirements of the Expenditure Plan. The Additional Bonds Test for both first and second lien bonds must be structured to maximize credit ratings and financing flexibility for the capital financing program. Measure I revenues, financing interest rates and the Additional Bonds Test will be the primary constraints on debt financing capacity. Lower revenues than those that are forecast, higher financing interest rates and a restrictive Additional Bonds Test will reduce debt financing capacity. Measure I revenues greater than forecast, lower financing interest rates and a less restrictive Additional Bonds Test will result in increased debt financing capacity.

**Policy Considerations and alternatives:** Pay-as-you-go project financing is the only alternative to debt financing for projects. Project readiness and need for financing will dictate the timing of the first financings; however, it is possible for SANBAG to lock-in current low interest rates with hedging strategies when there is some certainty of project readiness and capital requirements. Debt covenants that will be embodied in a financing resolution and trust indenture will establish policies for the debt financing program.

**Recommendations:** To be developed through committee discussions.

**Responsible Staff:** Terry McGuire, Director of Finance

**Name of Program:** Inter-program Issues

**Brief Description:** Several issues that affect multiple programs or may cause one program to affect others also exist, and do not fit neatly into discussion of any one program. They are discussed below.

**Policy Considerations and Alternatives:**

- 1) *Prioritization among programs, which may include borrowing from one or more programs to "frontload" another program.* As a hypothetical example, the Board may assign a higher priority to freeway construction than new major streets and rail projects, and choose to borrow revenues from those programs in the first years of the new sales tax measure to for early freeway construction, with provision for payback in later years. Metrolink funding in the current Measure I is a model for this approach. Informal discussions with staffs of SANBAG's member agencies suggests that no consensus exists thus far on prioritization of one or more programs over others, but that broad agreement should be reached, based on further discussion, before any such decision is made.
- 2) *Inter-program sequencing.* Beyond the more familiar issue of how to prioritize transportation projects within a particular program, projects funded by different programs may relate to one another such that a particular delivery sequence is desirable or even necessary to minimize construction-related transportation impacts and improve the efficiency of project delivery. Examples are the sequencing of freeway interchange (to be funded from the Valley Interchange Program) and freeway mainline improvements (to be funded from the Valley Freeway Program) within a given corridor, or the timing of arterial roadway improvements (to be funded from the Valley Major Streets Program) in proximity to a freeway interchange project (to be funded from the Valley Interchange Program). Staff suggests consideration of the following principle:
  - *Project delivery sequences that are determined to be more efficient and less costly to deliver and less impacting to the traveling public than others should be pursued.*
- 3) *Fiscal Management.* It is generally advantageous, when possible, to deliver projects without use of federal funds to avoid the federal local assistance process and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance issues. However, larger projects such as mainline freeway improvements and many freeway interchanges must be federalized under any circumstance. It therefore makes sense to maximize utilization of federal funds on those projects that must go through the federal process anyway, and avoid federal funding of projects that can otherwise be delivered locally with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review.

The Measure I 2010-2040 Expenditure Plan identifies a distribution of Measure, Federal and State, and fair share development revenues among the various Measure programs. However, these proportions will change among some programs because of updated Measure I 2010-2040 revenue forecasts, updates to the SANBAG nexus study, and changes in the availability of state and federal funds (such as passage of Propositions 1A and 1B in November, and allocation of federal monies to Alameda Corridor East grade separations in SAFETEA-LU). Staff suggests consideration of the following principles consistent with the Expenditure Plan:

- *Maximize use of federal funds on otherwise federalized projects*
- *Use Measure I and local dollars to leverage State and Federal dollars to the maximum possible extent*

DRAFT

**Name of Program:** New Legislative Initiatives

**Brief Description:** San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) is guided by its board approved legislative platform to seek legislative remedies for transportation policy and funding of transportation infrastructure projects. Additionally, in terms of securing federal funds for major projects within San Bernardino County, SANBAG adopts a list of projects seeking money through the annual appropriations process. In the past, SANBAG's strategy entailed a geographic approach concentrated on interchanges and highways, grade separations and transit projects in accordance to congestion relief needs. The result of this strategy provided small amounts of federal funds for a number of projects.

The passage of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), a multi-year authorization measure, modified the climate for securing federal funds for major transportation projects. Due to the number of earmarks authorized by SAFETEA-LU, the appropriations process for additional earmarks is much more competitive now and there is a clear push to promote completion of a transportation system rather than individual projects. Bearing in mind this shift, SANBAG might be in a better position to compete for limited federal funds by targeting large regional projects requiring a larger share of federal funding, which rallies the support of the entire Congressional Delegation representing San Bernardino County.

The following items are intended to promote discussion on SANBAG's future strategy for new legislative initiatives.

**Policy Considerations and Alternatives:**

- 1) *Seek Funding for All Projects.* As in the past, SANBAG may adopt a strategy to continue its current strategy for acquiring federal funds for all major transportation projects within San Bernardino County. The benefit to this approach is that every Board member can report to their respective jurisdictions that federal funds are being sought on such projects. The pitfalls of this strategy includes the amount of time it takes build up enough funding to complete a given project, the process to receive funding is fragmented, and allowable timeframes to utilize such funding may not coincide with the project delivery schedule.
  - *This year, newspaper articles cited that the House Appropriations Committee required representatives to better prioritize funding requests. In the coming year, it will be especially important for SANBAG to clearly communicate funding needs that benefit the regional as a whole.*
- 2) *Seek Funding for Single Large Corridor Project.* With a focus on a single, large-scale project of regional importance, SANBAG's federal funding request strategy might concentrate on a major projects along a mainline corridor. The single, large-scale corridor project may change from year to year and aim to complete corridors to alleviate congestion and/or promote goods movement. While this strategy will only seek funds for a single, large-scale corridor project for a given fiscal year, federal funds received might significantly reduce the need to utilize measure funds on a given project and thus measure funds can be used to complete other critical projects within San Bernardino County. Foreseeable benefits to implementing this strategy includes securing a larger share of federal funds a major projects and providing an opportunity to leverage state, federal and local funds to the highest degree possible. On the flip side, this approach would require SANBAG to be more competitive.
  - *To successfully implement this strategy, SANBAG will need to assess the amount of effort, commitment and resources this new strategy will require. Additionally, SANBAG will need to reach outside of the agency in a more aggressive manner to gain the support of the business community and other community stakeholders. Currently, SANBAG has one staff person focused on both the state and federal legislative strategy. Having adequate resources to assist board members effectively communicate this strategy and gain the support of Congress and the business community will be a key element to implementing this approach*



- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority  
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

### *Minute Action*

AGENDA ITEM: 7

**Date:** November 17, 2006

**Subject:** Revised Apple Valley Measure I Local Pass-Through Fund Audit

**Recommendation:\*** Accept the Revised Measure I Local Pass-Through Fund Audit Summary Sheets for the Town of Apple Valley for the year ending June 30, 2005

**Background:** Each year SANBAG provides for audits of all local jurisdictions receiving Measure I Local Pass-Through Funds. The audits examine both financial and compliance issues related to Measure I expenditures. At the time the 2004-2005 Measure I Audit Summary Report appeared before the Mountain/Desert Committee on June 16, 2006, the report contained draft material for the Town of Apple Valley. The audit has since been finalized by both Miers and Miers and the Town of Apple Valley. The 2004-2005 Measure I Local Pass-Through Fund Audit Summary Report will be amended to include the revised Measure I Audit Sheets included as Attachments A and B to this agenda item.

All audits for the year ending June 30, 2005, for Mountain/Desert jurisdictions are now complete. The report indicates that Mountain/Desert jurisdictions received \$21,751,418 in Measure I revenue and had remaining fund balances of \$35,760,755.

**Financial Impact:** This item has no direct impact upon the SANBAG budget. Measure I Local Pass-Through Funds are distributed by SANBAG and held by each local jurisdiction in a special Measure I fund. SANBAG expenses relative to the administration of the Measure I program are consistent with the adopted budget, Task No. 0650500, Measure I Administration – Mountain/Desert General.

**Reviewed By:** The 2004-2005 Measure I Audit Summary Report has previously been reviewed and unanimously approved by the Mountain/Desert Committee on June 16, 2006.

**Responsible Staff:** Deborah Robinson Barmack, Director of Management Services

\*

*Approved*  
San Bernardino Associated Governments

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Moved:

Second:

In Favor:

Opposed:

Abstained:

Witnessed: \_\_\_\_\_

## ATTACHMENT A

Mountain/Desert Subregion Statistical Table  
Measure I Local Pass-Through Summary Audit Table  
For the Year Ending June 30, 2005

Jurisdiction	Revenue	Interest*	Total Revenue	Prior Year Balance **	Expenditures	Ending Balance **	Bal/Rev
Adelanto	\$757,370	\$61,566	\$818,936	\$3,547,138	\$530,772	\$3,835,302	506%
Apple Valley	\$2,152,427	\$1,489,034	\$3,641,461	\$6,968,842	\$4,326,996	\$6,283,307	292%
Barstow	\$1,708,833	\$103,714	\$1,812,547	(\$151,637)	\$3,284,166	(\$1,852,552)	-108%
Big Bear Lake	\$623,478	\$6,161	\$629,639	(\$236,361)	\$471,058	(\$77,780)	-12%
Hesperia	\$2,663,142	\$488,084	\$3,151,226	(\$3,627,429)	\$2,441,132	(\$3,016,707)	-113%
Needles	\$232,385	\$39,116	\$271,501	\$664,064	\$469,278	\$466,287	201%
Twentynine Palms	\$781,160	\$47,415	\$828,575	\$2,946,474	\$2,317,707	\$1,442,260	185%
Victorville	\$6,491,988	\$431,521	\$6,923,509	\$17,403,526	\$8,613,657	\$15,713,378	242%
Yucca Valley	\$1,096,107	\$192,815	\$1,288,922	\$75,085	\$543,717	\$820,290	75%
SBCO Colorado River	\$74,744	\$7,279	\$82,023	\$302,195	\$849	\$383,369	513%
SBCO North Desert	\$1,190,975	\$43,425	\$1,234,400	\$1,720,033	\$580,644	\$2,373,789	199%
SBCO Morongo Basin	\$638,251	\$45,887	\$684,138	\$2,314,091	\$710,036	\$2,288,193	359%
SBCO Mountains	\$1,548,370	\$90,274	\$1,638,644	\$3,608,581	\$389,774	\$4,857,451	314%
SBCO Victor Valley	\$1,792,188	\$25,155	\$1,817,343	\$2,052,474	\$1,625,649	\$2,244,168	125%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$21,751,418</b>	<b>\$3,071,446</b>	<b>\$24,822,864</b>		<b>\$26,305,435</b>	<b>\$35,760,755</b>	<b>164%</b>

\* May include reimbursements to Measure I fund and other revenue transferred in.

\*\* Negative fund balances indicate debt associated with participation in SANBAG bonding program.

Valley Subregion Statistical Table  
Measure I Local Pass-Through Summary Audit Table  
For the Year Ending June 30, 2005

Jurisdiction	Revenue	Interest*	Total Revenue	Prior Year Balance	Expenditures	Ending Balance	Bal/Rev
Chino	\$1,059,706	\$9,648	\$1,069,354	(\$57,069)	\$937,644	\$74,611	7%
Chino Hills	\$1,124,246	\$35,159	\$1,159,405	\$1,534,431	\$579,579	\$2,114,257	188%
Colton	\$784,422	\$37,065	\$821,487	\$2,589,270	\$1,376,067	\$2,034,690	259%
Fontana	\$2,283,704	\$119,538	\$2,403,242	\$3,584,280	\$2,207,514	\$3,780,008	166%
Grand Terrace	\$179,160	\$1,718	\$180,878	\$117,226	\$166,187	\$131,917	74%
Highland	\$724,710	\$33,252	\$757,962	\$1,333,547	\$362,350	\$1,729,159	239%
Loma Linda	\$308,344	\$5,752	\$314,096	\$227,017	\$264,200	\$276,913	90%
Montclair	\$509,246	\$38,106	\$547,352	\$1,459,843	\$7,154	\$2,000,041	393%
Ontario	\$2,461,207	\$137,309	\$2,598,516	\$4,791,828	\$3,874,945	\$3,515,399	143%
Rancho Cucamonga	\$2,283,754	\$299,514	\$2,583,268	\$5,189,866	\$1,169,246	\$6,603,888	289%
Redlands	\$1,009,873	\$114,562	\$1,124,435	\$4,716,369	\$622,816	\$5,325,798	527%
Rialto	\$1,433,219	\$51,840	\$1,490,059	\$2,053,638	\$1,339,988	\$2,203,769	153%
San Bernardino	\$2,876,593	\$219,773	\$3,096,369	\$4,503,370	\$2,512,736	\$5,087,453	177%
Upland	\$1,065,610	\$142,203	\$1,207,813	\$1,767,309	\$162,376	\$2,313,046	264%
Yucaipa	\$698,757	\$8,119	\$706,886	\$446,165	\$1,061,399	\$391,652	13%
SBCO Valley	\$1,397,339	\$404,949	\$2,302,288	\$3,755,181	\$1,841,220	\$4,213,249	222%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$20,704,900</b>	<b>\$1,653,510</b>	<b>\$22,363,410</b>		<b>\$13,435,471</b>	<b>\$41,924,239</b>	<b>202%</b>

\* May include reimbursements to Measure I fund and other revenue transferred in.

**MEASURE I LOCAL PASS-THROUGH FUNDS - MOUNTAIN/DESERT  
2004-2005 SUMMARY AUDIT REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING JUNE 30, 2005**

JURISDICTION	MEASURE I REVENUE	INTEREST*	TOTAL REVENUE	PRIOR YEAR FUND BALANCE	EXPENDITURES	PROJECTS	YEAR END FUND BALANCE
APPLE VALLEY Regional/Arterial	\$1,399,078	\$1,411,597	\$2,810,675	\$3,471,845	\$1,897,904	Total Regional/Arterial	\$4,384,616
					\$11,705	Bear Valley Road./Kiowa Rd. to Mojave River, rehabilitation	
					\$1,266,817	Apple Valley Rd./Hwy. 18 to Bear Valley Rd., widen	
					\$177,371	Dale Evans Pkwy., construct median	
					\$5,109	High Desert Corridor, construct new road	
					\$559	Highway 18 west of Apple Valley Rd. to Conwin Rd., widen	
					\$426,004	Joshua Rd./Standing Rock Rd to Cahuilla Rd., construct new road	
					\$10,339	Ballot registrar costs	
					\$2,338,297	Total Local	
					\$1,305,388***	Town-wide streets, per the PMS, rehabilitation	
E&H Transit	\$107,621	\$4,624	\$112,245	\$160,103	\$1,028,137**	Apple Valley Rd./Hwy. 18 to Bear Valley Rd., widen	\$181,553
					\$4,772	Ballot registrar costs	
					\$90,795	Total E&H Transit / VVTA	
					\$90,000	VVTA	
TOTAL	\$2,152,427	\$1,489,034	\$3,641,461	\$6,968,842	\$795	Ballot registrar costs	\$6,283,307
					\$4,326,996	Total Expenditures	

\* May include reimbursements to the Measure I fund and other revenue

\*\* Expenditures not authorized per the Town's Measure I Five Year Capital Improvement Plan

\*\*\* Expenditures exceeded the categorical project expenditure limitation of one-half of annual Measure I revenue

## *Minute Action*

### AGENDA ITEM: 8

**Date:** November 17, 2006

**Subject:** Quarterly Administrative Report on SANBAG Federal Funding Programs

**Recommendation:** \* 1) Receive report on quarterly reporting and obligation status.  
2) Adopt a finding of compliance with obligation requirements for all affected agencies.

**Background:** Assembly Bill 1012 requires SANBAG to monitor and report to Caltrans on the use of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), and Regional Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds apportioned to San Bernardino County and allocated by the SANBAG Board. Federal funds apportioned to SANBAG are eligible for obligation for three years. Obligation refers to a commitment by the FHWA to reimburse an agency for an authorized amount of federal funds for a specific project. After three years, unobligated apportionments are subject to reprogramming and loss to SANBAG and its member agencies.

Because of SANBAG's requirement to manage the timely use of funds to avoid loss of funding pursuant to the provisions of AB1012, the SANBAG Board established a protocol that requires recipients of federal funds allocated by SANBAG to enter into contracts with SANBAG. These contracts include a description of the scope of the approved project, the amount of federal fund allocation, and the schedule of project implementation. In addition, the terms of the contracts require federal fund recipients

\*

*Approved*  
*Mountain/Desert Committee*

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Moved:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Second:* \_\_\_\_\_

*In Favor:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Opposed:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Abstained:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Witnessed:* \_\_\_\_\_

to submit quarterly progress reports on their projects to SANBAG until completion of the project. In accordance with adopted SANBAG policy, failure to comply with any provision of the contract constitutes grounds for revocation and reallocation of the funding by action of the SANBAG Board pursuant to the protocol specified in each contract.

#### **Quarterly Reporting Status**

Tables 1 – 4 summarize the projects to which funds were allocated, their quarterly reporting history, and the status of the project. All agencies required to report to SANBAG on the status of their projects submitted quarterly reports by October 15<sup>th</sup> as required by the terms of their contract.

#### **Obligation Status**

As mentioned earlier, federal funds are available for obligation for three years from the date of apportionment. Therefore, unobligated balances from federal apportionments through fiscal year 04/05 will be subject to reprogramming in November 2007. According to project schedules submitted in the project status reports, agencies are anticipating obligation of approximately \$28.2 million CMAQ (combined total MDAB and SCAB) and \$24.1 million STP by November 2007. Therefore, staff does not expect any CMAQ or STP funds to be subject to reprogramming in December, as indicated by the negative amounts shown in each table under "Expected Amount Subject to Reprogramming 11/07".

Please note that TE funds are now administered through the STIP. The obligation deadline, therefore, is in June each year, consistent with the State fiscal year. Any programmed funds not obligated will lapse and be unavailable to San Bernardino County until the 2008 STIP programming cycle.

**Financial Impact:** Funding for SANBAG's monitoring of local assistance project status is consistent with the adopted SANBAG Budget Task No. 37307000. The absence of critical project status and progress information provided in quarterly reports could result in SANBAG's inability to assure timely obligation of funds to avoid loss to the agency and its members.

**Reviewed By:** This item will be reviewed by the Plans and Programs Committee on November 15, 2006 and the Mountain/Desert Committee on November 17, 2006.

**Responsible Staff:** Ty Schuiling, Director of Planning and Programming

**TABLE 1**  
**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program Status**  
**Mojave Desert Air Basin**

Quarterly Reporting Status

Lead Agency	Project Description	Contract Number	Board Approval	Allocated Amount	Obligated Amount	2006 Quarterly Reports				Comments
						1	2	3	4	
Adelanto	Adelanto/Auburn/Jonathan Paving	01-052	12/06/00	\$224,000	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	RFA3 to be submitted 8/07
Barstow	1st Av @ Twin Rd Realignment	00-085	01/05/00	\$265,000	\$265,000	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 8/05
Barstow	UNGCNG Natural Gas Fueling Station	00-077	04/02/03	\$1,587,823	\$1,587,573	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 8/05
Barstow Transit	Purchase Replacement Alt Fuel Paratransit Vehicles	00-081	02/07/01	\$1,663,244	\$1,663,244	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 5/03
Barstow Transit	Paratransit Vehicle Replacement - Gas	20040701	09/06/03	\$613,846	\$289,950	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	\$100,304 obligated on 09/13/06
Barstow Transit	Purchase Replace Alt Fuel Paratransit Vehicles	20020140	09/06/03	\$863,000	\$276,000	Apr-06	Jul-06	*	Jan-06	Funds programmed in future years
Barstow Transit	Paratransit Vehicle Expansion	20040821	09/06/03	\$191,000	\$191,490	C	C	C	C	Obligated 9/13/06
Barstow Transit	Bus System - 27 Passenger Replacement Alt Fuel	20041303	09/06/03	\$1,142,000	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	*	Jan-06	All funds programmed in future years
Barstow Transit	Bus System - Expansion Bus - 35' Alt Fuel 06-2	20041301	10/05/05	\$673,000	\$672,828	C	C	C	C	Obligated 9/13/06
Caltrans	I.E. Transportation Management Center & PNR - Fontana	200626	10/05/05	\$1,350,000	\$0	*	*	Oct-06	*	REFA3 to be submitted 12/07
MBTA	Replacement Paratransit Vehicles - Gas	20040811	09/06/03	\$616,000	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	*	Jan-06	Funds programmed in future years
MBTA	Deviated Fixed Route Vehicle Replace - Alt Fuel(28 passen	20040812	09/06/03	\$327,000	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	*	Jan-06	Funds programmed in future years
MBTA	Deviated Fixed Route Vehicle Replace - Alt Fuel(33 passen	20040813	09/06/03	\$269,000	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	*	Jan-06	Funds programmed in future years
MBTA	Purchase Replacement Alt Fuel Paratransit Vehicles	00-082/01-083	02/07/01	\$2,460,974	\$2,460,974	C	C	C	C	Project fully obligated
SB County	Purchase Replacement Alt Fuel Paratransit Vehicles	20020808	09/06/03	\$371,000	\$370,941	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 4/05
SB County	Larrea Rd Paving	00-086	12/06/00	\$569,530	\$569,972	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 7/05
Victorville	Mesquite St Paving	00-087	12/06/00	\$534,690	\$534,781	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 8/05
Victorville	Park & Ride at Victor Valley College	01-048	12/06/00	\$931,987	\$102,000	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	RFA3 to be submitted 2/07
VVTA	I-15Amarogosa Park-n-Ride Lot Expansion	00-107	02/02/00	\$653,728	\$80,000	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	RFA3 to be submitted 12/06
VVTA	Replace Alt Fuel Paratransit Vehicles	SBDA1114	09/06/03	\$1,137,000	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	*	Jan-06	All funds programmed in future years
VVTA	Replacement CNG Buses	SBDA1084	09/06/03	\$3,498,750	\$3,499,190	C	C	C	C	Obligated 6/7/06
VVTA	Replace Alt Fuel Paratransit Vehicles	00-084	02/07/01	\$1,952,273	\$1,952,273	C	C	C	C	TEA-21 funds obligated
VVTA	Replacement CNG Buses	00-083	02/07/01	\$3,288,524	\$3,288,124	C	C	C	C	TEA-21 funds obligated
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>\$26,193,369</b>	<b>\$17,806,340</b>					

Obligation Status

Fiscal Year 06/07:	Fiscal Year 07/08:
Apportionment Subject to Reprogramming \$9,625,337	Apportionment Subject to Reprogramming \$5,194,916
Obligated Amount to Date* \$4,781,033	Obligated Amount for FY07/08 \$0
Additional Obligation Scheduled by 11/07 \$4,087,715	Additional Obligation Scheduled by 11/08 \$732,696
<b>Expected Amount Subject to Reprogramming 11/07 \$756,589</b>	<b>Expected Amount Subject to Reprogramming 11/08** \$4,462,220</b>
	(includes amount over-obligated in FY 06/07)

NOTES:

\* - Includes projects with closed contracts and projects funded through Board set-asides  
 \*\*NOTE: Not all SAFETEA-LU set-asides have been programmed yet. All funds will be programmed prior to reprogramming deadlines.  
 C - Project Complete/Cancelled  
 RFA1 - PSE Request for Authorization, RFA2 - ROW Request for Authorization, RFA3 - CONST Request for Authorization

**TABLE 2**  
**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program Status**  
**South Coast Air Basin**

**Quarterly Reporting Status**

Lead Agency	Project Description	Contract Number	Board Approval	Allocated Amount	Obligated Amount	2006 Quarterly Reports				Comments
						1	2	3	4	
Caltrans	I-E Transportation Management Center & PNR - Fontana	200626	02-027	\$5,050,000	\$0	*	*	Oct-06	*	RFA3 to be submitted 12/07
Caltrans	Mountain Avenue Traffic Signal Coordination	02-036	08/01/01	\$251,000	\$251,000	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 3/05
Chico Hills	CNG Time-Fill Refueling Stations	02-036	08/01/01	\$88,400	\$89,000	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 8/05
Colton	Alt. Fuel Park-n-Ride One-Stop Facility	00-097	02/02/00	\$0	\$0	C	C	C	C	Project canceled by City
Colton	Colton San Bernardino Pedestrian/Bikeway	02-027	08/01/01	\$432,704	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	RFA3 to be submitted 4/07
Colton	Washington St at Reche Cyn & Hunts Ln Mitigation	00-102	02/02/00	\$409,000	\$60,000	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	Project obligated 10/03
Fontana	Sierra Ave/Mulberry Ave ATMS PH 1 - Communications	02-038	08/01/01	\$2,590,000	\$2,590,000	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 8/05
Highland	5th Street Signal Interconnect	02-038	08/01/01	\$209,000	\$209,000	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 2/04
Highland	Base Line Road Signal Interconnect	02-021	08/01/01	\$96,000	\$96,000	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 8/05
Highland	Palm Avenue Signal Interconnect	02-029	08/01/01	\$57,000	\$57,000	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 8/05
Loima Linda	Anderson St/Tippencanoe Av Signal Interconnect	00-092	02/02/00	\$105,740	\$105,000	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 2/03
MARTA	Big Bear Visitors Trolley	02-039	08/01/01	\$274,442	\$274,442	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 5/03
MARTA	Replacement Paratransit Vehicle Purchase	200423	08/06/03	\$1,060,000	\$617,763	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	\$281,791 obligated 9/11/06
MARTA	Replacement Buses - Alt Fuel	200424	08/06/03	\$1,265,000	\$272,672	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	\$272,672 obligated in 9/11/06
MONTCLAIR	Bus System - Operating Assistance	SBD41055	08/06/03	\$80,000	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	*	Jan-06	\$40,000 to be obligated in FY05/06
Montclair	North Montclair Signal Interconnect	02-033	08/01/01	\$309,700	\$309,700	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 6/03
Montclair	Ramona Av Grade Separation	00-096	02/02/00	\$1,590,481	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	*	RFA3 to be submitted 1/07
Omnitrans	Replacement Paratransit Vehicles for Access Fleet	20040211	08/06/03	\$3,325,000	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	*	Jan-06	Funds programmed in future years
Rancho Cucamonga	Bus Replacement - Alt Fuel	SBD90105	08/06/03	\$5,795,000	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	*	Jan-06	Funds programmed in future years
Rancho Cucamonga	Base Line Road Signal Synchronization	02-020	08/01/01	\$100,000	\$100,000	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 5/03
San Bernardino	East Valley LING/CNG Fueling Facility	02-024	08/01/01	\$911,959	\$911,799	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 7/08
San Bernardino	Washington Street at Waterman Avenue Traffic Signal	02-035	08/01/01	\$106,000	\$106,000	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 5/03
San Bernardino	Metrolink Parking Structure	20020802	08/06/03	\$7,139,000	\$531,000	Apr-06	Jul-06	*	Jan-06	Funds programmed in future years
SB County	Crestline Commuter Park and Ride Lot	02-028	08/01/01	\$354,119	\$355,000	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 7/05
SB County	San Bernardino Avenue Traffic Signal/Synchronization	02-023	08/01/01	\$2,545,237	\$2,545,237	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 7/05
SB County	Wabash Av @ SH-39 - Install Traffic Signals	00-089	02/02/00	\$173,250	\$173,772	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 8/05
Upland	Upland Metrolink Station - Parking Expansion	20040825	08/06/03	\$2,776,800	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	*	Jan-06	Funds programmed in future years
Upland	SPRPE Right-of-Way Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail - Phase II	02-031	08/01/01	\$1,555,053	\$1,555,053	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 5/04
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>\$38,640,786</b>	<b>\$11,209,738</b>					

**Obligation Status**

Fiscal Year 06/07:		Fiscal Year 07/08:	
Apportionment Subject to Reprogramming	\$42,611,251	Apportionment Subject to Reprogramming	\$10,813,298
Obligated Amount to Date*	\$27,413,816	Obligated Amount for FY07/08	\$0
Additional Obligation Scheduled by 11/07	\$24,067,155	Additional Obligation Scheduled by 11/08	\$17,331,022
Expected Amount Subject to Reprogramming 11/07**	<b>\$-9,869,720</b>	Expected Amount Subject to Reprogramming 11/08**	<b>\$-8,617,724</b>
		<b>(includes amount over-obligated in FY 06/07)</b>	

**NOTES**

\* - Includes projects with closed contracts and projects funded through Board set-asides  
 \*\*NOTE: Not all SAFETEA-LU set-asides have been programmed yet. All funds will be programmed prior to reprogramming deadlines.  
 C - Project Complete/Cancelled  
 RFA1 - FSE Request for Authorization, RFA2 - ROW Request for Authorization, RFA3 - CONST Request for Authorization

**TABLE 3**  
**Regional Surface Transportation Program Status**

**Quarterly Reporting Status**

Lead Agency	Project Description	Contract Number	Board Approval	Allocated Amount	Obligated Amount	2006 Quarterly Reports				Comments
						1	2	3	4	
Adelanto	El Mirage Rehab & Paving - West City Limits to US395	01-036	10/04/00	\$1,375,488	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	RFA3 to be submitted 8/07
Apple Valley	Yucca Loma Bridge over Mojave River	200049	12/07/05	\$2,800,000	\$0	*	*	Oct-06	*	RFA1 to be submitted 10/06
Bakersfield	Linwood Rd Rehab - Commerce Pkwy to 34th West	01-040	10/04/00	\$423,000	\$423,000	C	C	C	C	Obligated 8/18/05
Bartow	East Main St Rehab - Bartow Rd to Muniel Dr	01-039	10/04/00	\$750,828	\$750,828	C	C	C	C	Obligated 8/17/05
Big Bear Lake	Signal at SR 18/Big Bear Bl/Paine Rd/Village Dr	01-035	10/04/00	\$495,280	\$495,280	C	C	C	C	\$200,000 contingency for cost overruns obligated 8/10/06
Colton	Main St/Kiowa Av Intersection Improvements	01-077	02/07/01	\$250,000	\$19,476	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	RFA2 to be submitted 1/07
Fontana	Sierra Av-Baseline to Highland Av-Widen 4-6 Lanes	01-076	02/07/01	\$0	\$0	C	C	C	C	Project cancelled 12/3/03
Fontana	Foothill Bl - East Av to Hemlock - Widen 4-6 Lanes	01-079/080	02/07/01	\$0	\$0	C	C	C	C	Project cancelled 12/03/04
Fontana	Jurupa/Mulberry Intersection Improvements	01-081	02/07/01	\$0	\$0	C	C	C	C	Project cancelled 9/03
Fontana	Baseline-Citrus to Maple - Widen 2-6 Lanes	01-078	02/07/01	\$0	\$0	C	C	C	C	Project cancelled 12/3/03
Hesperia	Ranchero Rd Grade Separation	SBD031276	12/07/05	\$3,400,000	\$0	*	*	Oct-06	*	RFA3 to be submitted 8/07
Highland	5th St - Boulder to SR30 - Widen 2-4 Lanes	01-075	02/07/01	\$870,600	\$870,600	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 8/25/06
Blair	Pepper Av-Foothill to Highland-Widen and Extend to 6 Lanes	01-078	02/07/01	\$0	\$0	C	C	C	C	Board reallocated funds to other projects 12/03
San Bernardino	State St-16th St to Foothill-Extend 2 lanes	01-082	02/07/01	\$2,005,000	\$80,000	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	RFA2 to be submitted 2/07
SB County	Needles Hwy-N St to Nevada State-Line-Realign, Rehab	01-033	10/04/00	\$2,478,840	\$1,043,975	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	RFA2 to be submitted 8/08
SB County	National Trails Hwy - Passing Lanes	01-038	10/04/00	\$1,907,284	\$310,000	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	RFA2 to be submitted 8/07
SB County	Cedar Av Widening PSE - Sliver Av to Valley Bl	01-074	02/07/01	\$0	\$0	C	C	C	C	Project cancelled 3/25/05
Twentynine Palms	Two Mile Road Rehab - Sunrise to Lear	01-037	10/04/00	\$0	\$0	C	C	C	C	Project cancelled 9/9/04
Victorville	I-15 La Mesa/Nisqually Interchange	SBD34170	12/07/05	\$3,800,000	\$0	*	*	Oct-06	*	RFA1 to be submitted 7/7
Victorville	I-15 Mojave Dr IC	33390	12/04/02	\$1,000,000	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	RFA3 to be submitted 1/07
Victorville	Bear Valley Rd Rehab - I-15 to Kiowa Rd	01-041	10/04/00	\$5,998,071	\$5,998,000	C	C	C	C	Obligated 08/23/05
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>\$27,685,369</b>	<b>\$9,392,193</b>					

**Obligation Status**

Fiscal Year 06/07:	Fiscal Year 07/08:
Apportionment Subject to Reprogramming	Apportionment Subject to Reprogramming
Obligated Amount to Date*	Obligated Amount for FY07/08
Additional Obligation Scheduled by 11/07	Additional Obligation Scheduled by 11/08
<b>Expected Amount Subject to Reprogramming 11/07 **\$-13,620,889</b>	<b>Expected Amount Subject to Reprogramming 11/08 **\$-19,183,619</b>
	(Includes amount of over-obligated in FY 06/07)

**NOTES**

- \* - Includes projects with closed contracts and projects funded through Board set-asides
- \*\*NOTE: Not all SAFETEA-LU set-asides have been programmed yet. All funds will be programmed prior to reprogramming deadlines.
- C - TEA-21 Funded Project Complete/Cancelled
- RFA1 - PSE Request for Authorization, RFA2 - ROW Request for Authorization, RFA3 - CONST Request for Authorization



**TABLE 4**  
**Regional Transportation Enhancement Program Status**

**Quarterly Reporting Status**

Lead Agency	Project Description	Contract Number	Board Approval	Allocated Amount	Obligated Amount	2008 Quarterly Reports				Comments
						1	2	3	4	
Barstow	I-15/Lenwood Road Landscaping	01-058	12/06/00	\$416,680	\$416,680	C	C	C	C	Obligated 8/16/05
Chino	Chino/Chino Hills Bikeway Connector	00-073	01/05/00	\$435,000	\$435,000	C	C	C	C	Obligated 3/05
Colton	Colton San Bernardino Ped/Bikeway Project	02-041	08/01/01	\$719,853	\$80,643	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	RFA3 to be submitted 12/06
Fontana	Fontana Portion of Inland Empire Pacific Electric Trail	200431	10/05/05	\$1,796,000	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	Funds to be obligated in FY05/06
Rancho Cucamonga	Rancho Portion of Inland Empire Pacific Electric Trail	20020201	10/05/05	\$1,796,000	\$1,796,000	C	C	C	C	Obligated 8/25/06
SB County	Santa Ana River Trail - La Cadena to Waterman	00-070	01/05/00	\$2,706,213	\$2,706,213	C	C	C	C	Project obligated
SB County	Santa Ana River Trail - Waterman Ave to California St	01-054	12/06/00	\$1,040,060	\$1,040,060	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 6/05
SB County	Lake Gregory Walkway	01-055	12/06/00	\$1,009,360	\$1,009,360	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 6/05
SB County	Green Valley Lake Museum Trail, Visitors Center	00-076	01/05/00	\$200,000	\$175,244	C	C	C	C	Project fully obligated
Twentynine Palms	National Park Drive Entry Project	00-075	01/05/00	\$91,000	\$91,000	C	C	C	C	Project obligated 5/05
Upland	SP/PE ROW Bike/Ped Trail	01-056	12/06/00	\$1,586,400	\$1,586,400	C	C	C	C	Project fully obligated
Upland	SP/PE Right-of-Way Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail - Phase II	02-031	08/01/01	\$908,000	\$908,000	C	C	C	C	Project fully obligated 8/04
US Forest Service	Rim of the World Scenic Trail	01-029	01/05/00	\$1,000,000	\$0	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	RFA1 to be submitted 7/07
Victorville	Riverwalk Trail	00-071	01/05/00	\$2,212,643	\$761,000	Apr-06	Jul-06	Oct-06	Jan-06	RFA2 to be submitted 3/08
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>\$16,897,208</b>	<b>\$10,965,600</b>					

**Allocation Status**

Fiscal Year 06/07:	Fiscal Year 07/08:
Apportionment Subject to Lapse \$3,741,000	Apportionment Subject to Lapse \$3,378,000
Allocated Amount to Date* \$0	Allocated Amount for FY07/08 \$0
Additional Allocation Scheduled by 7/07 \$2,545,210	Additional Allocation Scheduled by 7/08 \$3,450,902
<b>Amount Subject to Lapse 7/07* \$1,195,790</b>	<b>Expected Amount Subject to Lapse 7/08* \$-72,902</b>

**NOTES:**

\*Note: TE funds not allocated by the CTC in the year programmed will lapse. The funds will be available for programming in the 2008 STIP cycle  
 C - TEA-21 Funded Project Complete/Cancelled  
 RFA1 - FSE Request for Authorization, RFA2 - ROW Request for Authorization, RFA3 - CONST Request for Authorization

## SANBAG Acronym List

1 of 2

AB	Assembly Bill
ACE	Alameda Corridor East
ACT	Association for Commuter Transportation
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
APTA	American Public Transportation Association
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ATMIS	Advanced Transportation Management Information Systems
BAT	Barstow Area Transit
CAC	Call Answering Center
CALACT	California Association for Coordination Transportation
CALCOG	California Association of Councils of Governments
CALSAFE	California Committee for Service Authorities for Freeway Emergencies
CALTRANS	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CHP	California Highway Patrol
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality
CMP	Congestion Management Program
CNG	Compressed Natural Gas
COG	Council of Governments
CSAC	California State Association of Counties
CTA	California Transit Association
CTAA	Community Transportation Association of America
CTC	California Transportation Commission
CTC	County Transportation Commission
CTP	Comprehensive Transportation Plan
DMO	Data Management Office
DOT	Department of Transportation
E&H	Elderly and Handicapped
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ETC	Employee Transportation Coordinator
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FSP	Freeway Service Patrol
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FTIP	Federal Transportation Improvement Program
GFOA	Government Finance Officers Association
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HOV	High-Occupancy Vehicle
ICMA	International City/County Management Association
ICTC	Interstate Clean Transportation Corridor
IEEP	Inland Empire Economic Partnership
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991
IIP/ITIP	Interregional Transportation Improvement Program
ITS	Intelligent Transportation Systems
IVDA	Inland Valley Development Agency
JARC	Job Access Reverse Commute
LACMTA	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
LNG	Liquefied Natural Gas
LTF	Local Transportation Funds
MAGLEV	Magnetic Levitation
MARTA	Mountain Area Regional Transportation Authority
MBTA	Morongo Basin Transit Authority
MDAB	Mojave Desert Air Basin
MDAQMD	Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District
MIS	Major Investment Study
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding

## SANBAG Acronym List

2 of 2

MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MSRC	Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
NAT	Needles Area Transit
OA	Obligation Authority
OCTA	Orange County Transportation Authority
OWP	Overall Work Program
PA&ED	Project Approval and Environmental Document
PASTACC	Public and Specialized Transportation Advisory and Coordinating Council
PDT	Project Development Team
PPM	Planning, Programming and Monitoring Funds
PSR	Project Study Report
PTA	Public Transportation Account
PVEA	Petroleum Violation Escrow Account
RCTC	Riverside County Transportation Commission
RDA	Redevelopment Agency
RFP	Request for Proposal
RIP	Regional Improvement Program
ROD	Record of Decision
RTAC	Regional Transportation Agencies' Coalition
RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Program
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RTPA	Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
SB	Senate Bill
SAFE	Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
SANBAG	San Bernardino Associated Governments
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCRRA	Southern California Regional Rail Authority
SED	Socioeconomic Data
SHA	State Highway Account
SHOPP	State Highway Operations and Protection Program
SOV	Single-Occupant Vehicle
SRTP	Short Range Transit Plan
STAF	State Transit Assistance Funds
STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
STP	Surface Transportation Program
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TCM	Transportation Control Measure
TCRP	Traffic Congestion Relief Program
TDA	Transportation Development Act
TEA	Transportation Enhancement Activities
TEA-21	Transportation Equity Act for the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century
TIA	Traffic Impact Analysis
TMC	Transportation Management Center
TMEE	Traffic Management and Environmental Enhancement
TOC	Traffic Operations Center
TOPRS	Transit Operator Performance Reporting System
TSM	Transportation Systems Management
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
UZAs	Urbanized Areas
VCTC	Ventura County Transportation Commission
WTA	Victor Valley Transit Authority
WRCOG	Western Riverside Council of Governments

# ***San Bernardino Associated Governments***



## **MISSION STATEMENT**

To enhance the quality of life for all residents,  
San Bernardino Associated Governments  
(SANBAG) will:

- Improve cooperative regional planning
- Develop an accessible, efficient,  
multi-modal transportation system
- Strengthen economic development  
efforts
- Exert leadership in creative problem  
solving

To successfully accomplish this mission,  
SANBAG will foster enhanced relationships  
among all of its stakeholders while adding  
to the value of local governments.

Approved June 2, 1993  
Reaffirmed March 6, 1996